

Modern Philology

VOLUME XIV

September 1916

NUMBER 5

CHAUCER AND WYCLIF

As we look back at England of the later fourteenth century two men stand out beyond others in the realm of mind. Chaucer's distinction in literature is no greater than John Wyclif's in destructive thought and practical reform. His learning had earned him in the schools the prophetic title of Evangelical Doctor. His itinerant preachers carried his name and his teachings far and wide over the kingdom; he poured out homily, exhortation, argument, invective in English and Latin. He had set the church at odds with the state, bishops with princes, metropolitans with universities; he had divided the reigning house against itself; and though he had defied popes, such was his influence that he suffered persecution chiefly in his followers, died unmolested, and laid his bones, for a short rest only, in the churchyard at Lutterworth.

There was that in his teachings to commend them especially to broad men of the world. At bottom his work was a protest against professionalism in religion, a plea that religion should be mindful once more rather of the end than the means, of the human soul rather than of an intricate apparatus. Ambition and convenience drive every system toward elaboration, before which the layman has helplessly to resort to the man of special training. Every system may have to be brought back to simplicity, lest its main purpose be impeded or forgotten. So much we may have to admit, however much we may revere an imposing historic system. The church was thus brought back at the Reformation, but Wyclif showed the

way a century and a half earlier. To this end¹ he assailed the papal court and the hierarchy, whose interest it was to maintain a complex professionalism; to this end he assailed the regular orders—partly a manifestation and partly a tool of professionalism—who he held laid more stress on their own cramping and minute rules than on the teachings of the Gospels; to this end he assailed those dogmas especially on which professional power rested, the doctrine of the Eucharist and the power of the keys.² It was the power to bring God visibly to their altars, and to influence the eternal destiny of man, which left the mediaeval world almost helpless in the hands of the clergy, and which gave them a sphere whence they could control but where they could not be reached. At the voice without reply which came from thence the flesh might repine, but as yet reason did not chafe. Anyone with a historical imagination must regard with veneration the stately words, "Et ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam, et porte inferi non prevalebunt adversus eam. Et tibi dabo claves regni celorum. Et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in celis." For on them is based the greatest institution that ever existed. But Wyclif, for all his intellectual training, was a practical man. He was the champion of the state against the church, of the people against those who preyed on them, of the secular clergy who were doing (well or ill) the essential work of the church against those who interfered with them. The remarkable thing is that, being a highly professional man himself, he set his face like a flint against professionalism; in him Protestantism grew out of scholasticism.

¹ The unity and far-reaching design in Wyclif's work was doubtless a growth, and less plain to him than to us. The purposefulness may have been as it were rather emotional than intellectual. He attacked what he disliked, and what he disliked was apparatus. But as we look back at his battles we see they resemble a well-planned campaign. Even Luther felt that Wyclif's teachings were practical rather than theoretical ("Wicklef und Huss haben nur das Leben des Pabstes angefochten": *Tischreden*, in *Sämmtliche Schriften* [St. Louis, 1887], XXII, 892). Much of his teaching has long been seen to follow from his theory of dominion—that the right to rule depends on a relation to God, not to an institution, an idea thoroughly moral and practical in its results.

² In the earliest known accusation against Wyclif, in the bulls of Gregory XI (1377), eight of the eighteen or nineteen charges relate to his views on the power of the keys (Lechler, *John Wiclif*, English tr., London, 1881, p. 191; *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*). Similarly in 1382 (Lechler, p. 420). There is a good study of the spirit of Wyclif's work in H. W. Clark's *History of English Nonconformity*, I, 23–68.

Wyclif's views and activities are likely to have appealed to Chaucer, no uncritical mystic or devotee, yet a man interested in the essence of religion, a servant of the state, and deeply sympathetic with humanity, with a keen eye for inconsistency and sham. Further, it is hardly credible that he was not very familiar with Wyclif's views and even with the man himself, through his own friends. Wyclif was supported by the royal family, especially by John of Gaunt and the mother and wife of Richard II, with some of whom Chaucer seems to have enjoyed a certain intimacy. Numerous adherents and supporters of Wyclif were among his friends and associates; I shall not undertake to collect all their names, but the fact is clear.¹ The question is not of Chaucer having been a Lollard, or of having drawn an admiring portrait of Wyclif in the Parson of the *Prolog*;² he was not such stuff as martyrs are made of, but something of a Laodicean. But it is certain that he would know and likely enough that he would sympathize with some of Wyclif's views. If we find passages in the *Canterbury Tales* agreeing strikingly with certain of Wyclif's most emphatic opinions not often found elsewhere, it is an acceptable conjecture that Chaucer here shows his influence.

¹ On some friends or associates of Chaucer's who were more or less supporters or adherents of Wyclif, cf. Kittredge in *Med. Phil.*, I, 9, 13, 17; Tait in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, XLVIII, 151 (cf. *Life Records of Chaucer*, Chaucer Soc., 154, 163, 203 f., 210, 283 f.). XLIV, 400 (cf. *L. Rec.*, 163, 173). The men are Clifford, Latimer, Clanvowe, Sir Richard Stury, Henry Percy. Chaucer's friend Strode had been a colleague and friend, but a theological opponent, of Wyclif (Jones in *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXVII, 114; Kuhl, *ibid.*, XXIX, 272-73; Gollancz in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*).

² This notion has been disposed of, especially by Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 459-84. Simon's *Chaucer a Wyclifite* (Chaucer Soc., *Essays*, III, 227-92) has found little favor. The Shipman (if it is he) calling the puritanical Parson a "loller" means no more than a modern fellow calling someone of dark complexion a "Dago." A thorough Wyclifite would hardly be found on a pilgrimage. But though many of the traits of the Parson are found elsewhere, or might spontaneously embody the Christian ideal of any age, there is no reason to deny Simon's belief that the portrait reflects Chaucer's esteem for some of the virtues of the Wyclifites, as their emphasis on the teachings of the Gospels, their fearless preaching (cf. Matthew, *Engl. Wks. of Wyclif*, E.E.T.S., p. 264), their pastoral zeal and simple manners. The more human limitations which the Parson shows later might even show Chaucer's consciousness of a certain tendency to puritanism in Wyclif's teachings. The Parson shows a narrow tactlessness in rebuking the Host in the *Shipm. Prol.* (1171) for swearing, and in reprobating tales and rimes in the *Paro. Prol.* (31-34) after three days of rimed tales (cf. *De officio pastorali*, Matthew, p. 438). Chaucer himself grew as the *Tales* grew, and his liking for the ideal gave way before his love of truth. I should add that there is no evidence of Chaucer's having used the Wyclifite Bible; J. H. Ramsay's evidence is wholly unconvincing (*Academy*, XXII, 435-36). Wyclifite or not, he would have stuck to the Vulgate. Cf. B. F. Westcott, *Hist. of the Engl. Bible* (London, 1905), p. 19, note.

The passages involved are few, but there is no mistaking their significance. The most important are two in the *Prolog*. Of the Parson it is said,

Ful looth were him to cursen for his tythes. [l. 486.]

For non-payment or "subtraction" of tithes a man might be excommunicated with the major sentence, though not by the parson himself;¹ the parson was to declare that the defaulter might be or *ipso*

¹ This is referred to in the *Friar's Tale*, where the functions of the archdeacon's court are described (ll. 1312-18); the last two lines mean that the bishop enforced by excommunication the archidiaconal court's sentence:

And smale tythes weren foule y-shent,
If any persone wolde up-on hem playne.
[I emend Skeat's punctuation.]
Ther mighte asterte him no pecunial peyne.
For smale tythes and for smal offringe
He made the peple pitously to singe.
For er the bisshop caughte hem with his hook,
They weren in the erchedeknes book.

The bringing of suits for tithes in lay courts became discountenanced in the twelfth century owing to ecclesiastical opposition (Selden, *Historie of Tithes*, London, 1618, pp. 421-22), though they were sometimes sued for in the court of the exchequer and other lay courts (Phillimore, *Ecc. Law of the Ch. of Engl.*, London, 1873, p. 1502). The jurisdiction of the church courts in these cases was confirmed in the reigns of Edward I and II and Henry VIII (*ibid.*). Non-payers after three warnings were to be punished with the greater excommunication ("anathema"), according to a decree of the Council of Rouen, held in the seventh century (Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, tr. Clark, V, 211-12); see Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici* (Leipzig, 1881), II, xvi, vii, 5; and his *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts* (*ibid.*, 1909), p. 574. There are archiepiscopal constitutions to much the same effect (1328-48) in Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, pp. 187, 189. Archbishop Islip of Canterbury decreed in 1352 that failure to pay the greater tithes should be punished with the greater excommunication (Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 26); so did William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester (*ibid.*, p. 390). Cf. also a decree of Archbishop Courtenay, 1393 (*ibid.*, p. 220); also Friedberg, *Corp. iur. can.*, lib. III, xxx, 5 (a decretal of Pope Alexander III, 1159-81); Schmalzgrueber, *Jus eccl. univ.* (Rome, 1843-44), III, ii, 685; Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Engl.*, III, 345; Pollock and Maitland, *Hist. of Engl. Law*, I, 106, 554-58. Among the fifteen excommunicable sins *Cursor mundi* (29322 ff.) puts withholding or falsification of tithes. Wyclif reprobates curates for cursing for tithes (see below). That it was the greater excommunication which was inflicted is indicated in one of the Wyclifite works quoted below, *The Grete Sentence of Cure*. So difficult was the collection of tithes, and so set was the church on getting them, that at one time it had stigmatized as heretics those who did not pay up (H. C. Lea, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, I, 26). One of the most impudent bits of priestcraft I have found is in Robert Manning of Bourne's *Handlyng Synne* (9315 ff.): "to withhold tithes is sacrilege, and to pay ensures long life, good health, grace in the soul and forgiveness of sins." That is all! I have said that the tithes were to be recovered by suit in the church courts, the decree of which was enforced by excommunication, which in turn was followed up by the secular authorities (cf. p. 262 below, and Matthew, *Engl. Works*, p. 510; also the beginning of this note). Though Chaucer and the *Cursor mundi* (e.g., 29500 ff.) speak of priests cursing, the parish priest has and had no power to inflict the greater excommunication (St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, Pars III, Supplementum, Quaestio XXII, art. I.; Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, 196). But among the Provincial Constitutions at the end of Lyndwood, pp. 34 (and cf. earlier, pp. 196, 201), is one by Archbishop Winchelsey, 1305, according to which a parishioner who did not pay his tithes was to be warned thrice, and then if recalcitrant to be excluded from the church-building (which would perhaps be equivalent to the lesser excommunication), and then compelled to pay by ecclesiastical censure (presumably through the courts). The Wyclifite *Office of Curates* (Matthew, p. 152) complains that

facto was excommunicated (*excommunicatio a jure, ferendae or latae sententiae*). Chaucer clearly felt the sordidness of using so solemn a spiritual weapon for such mundane reasons. The other passage is in the description of the Sumner (ll. 653-62):

And if he fond o-wher a good felawe,
He wolde techen him to have noon awe,
In swich cas,¹ of the erchedeknes curs,
But-if a mannes soule were in his purs;
For in his purs he sholde y-punished be.²
'Purs is the erchedeknes helle,' seyde he.
But wel I woot he lyed right in dede;
Of cursing oghte ech gilty man him drede—
For curs wol slee, right as assoiling saveth—
And also war him of a *significavit*.

This sounds quite innocent. Chaucer seems to rebuke the archdeacon's official for speaking lightly of excommunication. But our suspicions are aroused, both by the ambiguity of this warning (the curse and the absolution stand or fall together, but do they stand or do they fall?) and also by the very strength of the language. Who but a narrow and ill-informed ecclesiastic would say that an archdeacon's ban for concubinage would slay a soul? Our suspicion

curates will not give communion to those who are behind on tithes. An early printed copy of the *Sarum Manual* directs curates four times a year to denounce the greater excommunication against various offenders, including non-payers of tithes: "Isti sunt generales articuli majoris excommunicationis" . . . "Also men of holy chirche have leve by Goddis lawe, for to acurse al tho by name that wyl noght paye ther tythes, as it is writen in many places in the lawe of holy Chirche" (Arnold, *Select Engl. Works of Wyclif*, Oxford, 1871, III, 267, 269); on this see also Arthur Ogle, *The Canon Law in Mediaeval England*, p. 172. Obviously this does not mean that the parson excommunicated; he merely declared that certain persons by church law might be or already were excommunicated (like the modern *excommunicatio a jure, ferendae sententiae*, or *latae sententiae*). It may be partly this commination that both Chaucer and Wyclif refer to. It is doubtful if the lesser excommunication (exclusion from the sacraments) would be called by the severe word "cursen" (defined in the *Promptorium parvulorum*, about 1440, as "excommunico, anatematizo," which well fits the terrifying language of the greater. What a parson could do was to exclude from the church building, declare that a person had made himself liable to excommunication, and bring suit against him; this latter would result in the greater excommunication by the ordinary (in default of payment), and this in turn in imprisonment by the secular authorities. Doubtless procedure was not always uniform, or always in fact what it was by law. This note will supplement and correct Skent's quotation (V, 45) from Bell that "refusal to pay tithes was punishable with the lesser excommunication." See also Myrc's *Instructions for Parish Priests* (E.E.T.S., 1868), pp. 21, 24, 80. The best account of excommunication in general is in H. C. Lea's *Studies in Church History* (Philadelphia, 1883), pp. 235-521; see especially pp. 382, 458, 479.

¹ I.e., if he were caught in incontinence.

² Strikingly paralleled in *Piers Plowman*, A-text, III, 137-39.

is confirmed by the last line. *Significavit* is the first word of the writ *De excommunicato capiendo*, issued from chancery at the request of the ordinary in the king's name, directing the sheriff to enforce justice against the culprit; which meant imprisoning, till he had been absolved, anyone who had been excommunicated for forty days with the major excommunication.¹ The anticlimax, in a writer of Chaucer's sly subtlety, makes the meaning clear; however it may be with the eternal consequences of excommunication, we should look out for the temporal ones anyway. This throws us back once more to l. 661. Chaucer seems to speak lightly and skeptically of both excommunication and absolution.² Both passages show an attitude of doubt toward the power of the keys as commonly understood in Chaucer's day.

On no subject does Wyclif express himself with more frequency and more intensity than on the abuses which had grown up about the practice of excommunication. He denies its spiritual efficacy and denounces its use, especially as a weapon against purely worldly or financial offenses toward the clergy, such as non-payment of tithes. "Alle þo þat mystipen ony goodis ben cruely cursed foure times in þe ȝeer"; great is the author's indignation; "whi cursen oure weiward curettis so many mennus soulis to helle, and bodies to prison . . . for a litel muk?"³ "Cursing is a fendis fynding

¹ This procedure seems to date back at least to the twelfth century; but later the clergy sometimes complained that it was not enforced. The writ as given by Bracton begins, "*Significavit nobis venerabilis pater N. . . . quod talis . . . excommunicatus est.*" See Bracton, *De legibus Angliæ* (Rolls Ser.), VI, 370; Pollock and Maitland, *Hist. Engl. Law* (2d ed.), I, 478; Makower, *Const. Hist. Ch. of Engl.*, p. 452; Maitland, *Const. Hist. of Engl.*, p. 524; *Select Essays in Anglo-American Legal Hist.* (Boston, 1908), II, 310-11; Blackstone, *Commentaries*, III, vii (Philadelphia, 1875, II, 101); Wilkins, *Concilia*, I, 749-50; Cowell's and Blount's *Law Dictionaries* (London, 1708 and 1670); *Les Termes de la Ley* (ibid., 1721), p. 320; Holdsworth, *Hist. Engl. Law*, I, 433; Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Engl.* (Oxford, 1878), III, 357; J. F. Stephen, *Hist. Crim. Law in Engl.* (London, 1883), II, 412; Phillimore, *Ecc. Law*, 1263, 1404, 1419. The law was still in force in the nineteenth century. In the thirteenth century one who remained excommunicate for forty days, the council of Béziers decreed, was to be punished as a heretic (Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, I, 404).

² This is commonly understood as referring to sacramental absolution, as part of the sacrament of penance. The context favors canonical absolution, i.e., the removal of the sentence of excommunication. Either is possible.

³ *Grete Sentence of Cure* (Thomas Arnold, *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, Oxford, 1871, III, 309-12). This may be by a follower, and not by Wyclif himself, but it reflects his views. Here and elsewhere I have not attempted the impossible and unnecessary task of distinguishing Wyclif's works from those of contemporary adherents; I simply follow Arnold and Matthew. He frequently declares also that tithes should be withheld from unworthy parsons, and over and over again even denounces tithes alto-

to curse men þus for worldly godis."¹ He constantly makes light of the general efficacy of excommunication, and condemns its free use; God blesses him who is cursed wrongfully.² He denounces the procedure of the writ *Significavit*.³

Chaucer's implied doubt of the value of assailing is fully paralleled in Wyclif, whether Chaucer means canonical or sacramental absolution. Doubt of the saving power of the church's lifting of her ban is entirely involved in Wyclif's doubt of the efficacy of the ban. Sacramental absolution he constantly belittles. He discourages auricular confession, implying small regard for absolution; it does much good and much harm and should not be compulsory; he

gether (cf. such of the Latin works as *De blasphemia*, pp. 183 ff., *De civili dominio*, pp. 310 ff., and *Sermones*, II, 307; the Latin works are always quoted here from the Wyclif Society's edition). But sometimes he allows them (*De civili dominio*, I, 317 ff.).

¹ *De officio pastoralis*, Matthew, p. 453. See also *How Men Ought to Obey Prelates, Of Clerks Possessioners, The Office of Curates, How Satan and His Children, Why Poor Priests* (Matthew, pp. 36, 132, 144-46, 150, 156, 160-61, 214, 250); also the *Wyclifite Apology for the Lollards*, pp. 13-25 (Camden Soc., 1842). Likewise, in the Latin works, he condemns cursing "pro temporalibus," or "principaliter propter pecuniam"; one who excommunicates for tithes excommunicates himself. See *De blasphemia*, pp. 70-71, 103, 106, 175; *De ecclesia*, p. 154; *Sermones*, II, 238-39, 314; III, 159; *De officio regis*, pp. 167, 171, 175, 227; *De civili dominio*, I, 277, 335 ff. (but it is allowable if the motive of the excommunicator is not lucre but the good of the delinquent, pp. 353 ff. Faith, here's an equivocator!). St. Thomas Aquinas declares that excommunication may be inflicted "pro temporali damno" (including presumably the withholding of tithes); *Summa* (Rome, 1906, Vol. XII, Suppl., p. 43), III, Supplementum, Q. XXI, art. iii.

² One of the views attributed to Wyclif by Benedict XI is "Non est possibile hominem excommunicari ad sui dampnum, nisi excommunicetur primo et principaliter a se ipso"; another attacks the exaction of temporalities by means of ecclesiastical censures. See Arnold, III, 218; *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, LXIII, 208-9, 214; *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (Rolls Ser., 1858), pp. 250, 251, 279, 321, etc.; G. M. Trevelyan, *Engl. in the Age of Wyclif*, p. 48. All this appears repeatedly in the English works: *How Men Ought to Obey Prelates, Of Prelates, Office of Curates, Of Poor Preaching Priests, Of Dominion* (Matthew, 35-36, 75, 153, 277, 287-88); *Sermons on the Gospels, Church Temporalities, Grete Sentence of Curs, Church and Her Members, Octo in quibus* (Arnold, II, 159; III, 217, 328-29, 354, 450). Still oftener the view appears in the Latin works: *De blasphemia*, pp. 58, 70, 97, 98 (he reprobates the formal excommunication with bell and candle), 145, 173; *De officio regis*, pp. 22, 111, 166-76, 192, 227-37; *Sermones*, II, 183, 201, 302, 305, 313 f.; III, 147-48, 264, 491; *De ecclesia*, p. 153; *De civili dominio*, pp. 274 ff., 374 f.; *Dialogus*, p. 56. He does admit that excommunication may sometimes be allowable (*De blasphem.* pp. 97, 103; cf. also the *Wyclifite Apology for the Lollards*, Camden Soc., 1842, pp. 13-25). Thomas Aquinas says that even an unjust excommunication has its effect, since exclusion from the means of grace deprives of grace (*Summa*, III, Suppl., Q. XXI, art. iv). This is not inconsistent with the saying of Pope Innocent III that a man might be bound in the sight of the church but free in the sight of God. As one of its reforms the Council of Trent recommended more moderation in the use of the greater excommunication; the lesser was abolished in the nineteenth century. What Wyclif objected to was of course the practice rather than the theory.

³ *Of Prelates, Office of Curates* (Matthew, pp. 74, 95, 146); *De blasphem.*, pp. 108, 271; *De ecclesia*, p. 156; *Sermones*, III, 209-10, 264; *De officio regis*, pp. 169, 175.

declares that if the penitent is not contrite, absolution is useless, and if he is, it is needless; God alone absolves, the priest merely announces.¹

Doubtless Chaucer and Wyclif were not the only men in the fourteenth century who held liberal views as to the power of the keys.² But the writer has been through a great many literary works of Chaucer's day and somewhat earlier without finding any parallels. The height of Wyclif's attack on the power of the keys came only some half-dozen years before the date when Chaucer probably wrote the *Prolog*. It is hard to doubt that the *obiter dicta* of the poet reflect the loud denunciations of his contemporary. That he does not also reflect Wyclif's attacks on the doctrine of the Eucharist may be due to the latent streak of mysticism in his own nature. In any case this doctrine is more attractive to a practical and warm-hearted man than the other.

I say little of other, less tangible, ties between Chaucer and Wyclif, which show that they were interested in some of the same things, and that as to opinions which they held in common with others they shaded strongly toward each other. Everybody assailed the clergy, but the reformer's club and the poet's rapier made for the same points; there is a striking resemblance in what they say, and

¹ Cf. the fifth of the articles condemned by bull in 1382 (Lechler, p. 420; *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, LXIII, 213). See also *Of Prelates, Office of Curates, Of Confession* (Matthew, pp. 106-7, 160, 328 ff.); *Sermons on the Gospels* (over and over again), *De Pontificum Romanorum Schismate, The Church and Her Members, On the Twenty-five Articles* (Arnold I, 18, 35, 47; II, 87, 100, 206; III, 252-56, 358, 461; also *Fasc. Zis.*, 278, 321, etc.; Trevelyan, *Engl. in the Age of Wyclif*, pp. 140-42. The Latin works are full of such views: *De civili dominio*, pp. 259-60; *Polemical Works*, II, 622, 625; *Sermones*, I, 283, 307-10, 341; II, 62-63, 133, 138-39; III, 27, 67, 182, 261; IV, 102-3, 118, 122-23, 135, 146; *De ecclesia*, pp. 577, 585; *De apostasia*, p. 35; *De blasphem.*, pp. 58, 136, 140; *De eucharistia et poenitentia*, pp. 333 (here he is more orthodox; auricular confession is necessary, but not absolutely necessary), and 335. Here and elsewhere a certain amount of inconsistency does not prove difference of authorship; what an innovator says, and even what he believes, may vary from time to time, with his audience, the development of his principles, and the like.

² The thirteenth-century Middle High German writer suggestively nicknamed Freidank (possibly Walther von der Vogelweide), belittles sacramental absolution (Hildebrand's *Didaktik aus der Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, in *Deutsche National-Litteratur*, IX, 336). The Waldenses had attacked the Catholic doctrine of the power of the keys; so had the Cathari, the Amaurians, and other strange heretics (Lea, *Hist. of the Inquis. of the Middle Ages*, I, 79, 93; II, 150, 320). The large use of excommunication in the later Middle Ages to further the political and financial interests of the church became a burning scandal; so much so that she had to legislate against those who settled down to a comfortable life under her ban and made no effort to remove it. But the loyalty of her children is well shown by the almost universal acceptance of her principles. For other

they clearly thought much the same, with different intensity.¹ One other tie between the two may be mentioned. Chaucer was interested in certain of the theologico-philosophical issues with which Wyclif had concerned himself, especially in the question of foreordination, which with Chaucer took the form of the question why things happen—the relation between fortune, free-will and divine foreknowledge.² That he was somewhat acquainted with the later "literature of the subject" is shown by his reference to Archbishop Bradwardine (*N.P.T.*, 4432 ff.), the "Profound Doctor," who had died as early as 1349 but influenced Wyclif's views on predestination and antipelagianism (though Wyclif's views were less extreme). It is not unlikely that Chaucer's deep interest and learning in astrology may have had a relation to his interest in foreordination; the connection between the matters is clearly recognized by St. Thomas Aquinas, John of Salisbury, Dante, and other thinkers.³ When we find the concretely minded and unphilosophical Chaucer ever recurring to the subject of foreordination, we cannot but see a connection with the fact that the subject was a very lively one in his day. That Chaucer was not fertile in original thinking leads us to believe that here he reflects contemporary views, and that as to excommunication he reflects Wyclif's.

condemnation of the excessive use of excommunication see Matthew, *Engl. Works of Wyclif*, p. 509. Robert Manning of Bourne berates the priest who "for little curseth his parishoners" (*Handlyng Synne*, pp. 10881 ff.); but he bids the "lewed man, þou shalt cursyng doute" (p. 10921). Both passages are in the French original. Dante agrees pretty well with St. Thomas, as we should expect. He sometimes seems liberal:

Per lor maledizion sì non sì perde,
Che non possa tornar l'eterno amore,
Mentre che la speranza ha fior del verde.—[*Purg.* III, 133-35.]

But the contumacious toward holy church, even though repentant at the last, must wait in Antepurgatory thirty times as long as they resisted the church, unless prayers shorten their suspense.

¹ Many of the similar passages are cited by Skeat, but far from all. To collect them would take too much space, but here are a few which I might add: *Prol.*, 649-51, *Fri. T.*, 1362, Matthew, p. 249, Arnold, III, 288 (on blackmail for concubinage); *Prol.*, 259-63, Arnold, II, 216 (on the voluminous garb of the friars); *Prol.*, 235-37, Matthew, p. 9 (on their singing, playing and dancing "to get the stinking love of damsels"); *Suma. T.*, 1832, 1840, Latin *Sermones*, III, 222 (on the affected use of French by the friars).

² Cf. the present writer in *Med. Phil.*, III, 370-72. On the prominence in the fourteenth century of the controversy as to predestination and free-will, and as to Bradwardine's prominence in it, and his influence on Wyclif, see Carleton Brown in *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XIX, 128-30, 144. There was a great deal of popular fatalism in the fourteenth century; Chaucer's admiring contemporary Thomas Usk says, "Wherefore the comune sentence of the people in opinion, that everything after destenace is ruled, false and wicked is to beleve" (*Testament of Love*, III, ix, 5-7, in *Oxford Chaucer*, VII).

³ See the writer's *Scene of the Franklin's Tale Visited* (Chaucer Soc., 1914), chap. III.

It would be a pity to stop here without saying a little about Chaucer's religious position in general, especially since one or two of the passages discussed above have been used for proof of a far greater heterodoxy than they really show. Chaucer students will greatly miss the late Professor T. R. Lounsbury's learning and charm, but he mistook both Chaucer and his age when he represented him as a kind of agnostic.¹ One of the passages he mainly relied on was the Sumner's scoff at excommunication and absolution, in which, however, most people will be readier to see the spirit of Wyclif than the spirit of Huxley. Another is the opening lines of the *Legend of Good Women*, where Chaucer avers that we know of the joy of heaven and the pain of hell only through books, and thereby bespeaks credence for the old stories which he is about to extract from books; we marvel at Mr. Lounsbury's argument when we realize that the passage makes directly against his position. Finally, in the *Knight's Tale* (ll. 2805-15), Chaucer does not know where Arcite's departing soul went, except that it was to a place where he had never been himself.² In this undoubtedly flippant refusal of the eternal blazon to ears of flesh and blood, there may well be nothing but flippancy; Chaucer certainly did not know and undeniably had never been there. A somewhat light tone is characteristic of the poem. But more than this, he may be rejecting impatiently Boccaccio's lengthy and frigid description of Arcite's aviation through the celestial spheres;³ or (Dryden's interpretation in his *Palamon and Arcite*) he may be doubtful as to the eternal destiny of such a virtuous pagan as Arcite. No one of these three acceptable explanations implies religious skepticism.

Certain other matters bear on Chaucer's religious position. The apparent irreverence which Mr. Lounsbury detected in Chaucer's

¹ *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 458-536. See the review by Kittredge in *The Nation*, LIV, 231-32.

² His spirit chaunged hous, and wente ther
As I cam never, I can nat tellen wher, etc.,

a passage easily misunderstood. It does not mean "Since I was never there I cannot tell where" (as not being causal in Chaucer); it means "went to a place where I never was, I cannot tell where."

³ *Teseide*, XI, 1 ff., a passage which Chaucer had used already in the *Troilus*, V, 1807-27. Elsewhere too in the *Troilus* he had adopted pagan eschatology (IV, 789-91, 1187-88). Neither the pagan nor the Christian other-world would have fitted the tone of the *Knight's Tale*. The fact that so unobvious a thing is said at all seems to indicate a certain levity; but levity is a totally different thing from skepticism.

works is not only amply paralleled in other mediaeval writers, not always worldly ones, either; it is largely an optical illusion. At a time when all old women dressed as nuns do now, when people drank their wine at dinner out of cups like chalices and lighted their tables with high-altar candlesticks, there was not the distinction between sacred and secular which we observe (to the uncertain advantage of the sacred). Irreverence is usually more of a shock to the taste than to the conscience, and no one who has lifted the choir seats in mediaeval churches and peered at the *misereres* will deny that mediaeval taste differed from modern in these matters. God was so sturdy a reality to our forefathers that his name and his personality had no need to be protected from the rude world by a hedge of taboos; the conception made up in solidity what it lacked in vastness, in comprehensibility what it lacked in adequacy. Since any idea of the infinite is merely symbolic at best, the mediaeval attitude may have had its advantages. As to Chaucer's view of the clergy, that would prove little, as Mr. Lounsbury recognized; the most earnest believers are frequently, though not always, their severest critics. It suffices to say that Chaucer on the whole is much more charitable toward the clergy than most of his contemporaries are.¹ Mr. Lounsbury's belief in Chaucer's unusually skeptical habit of mind about secular things, though an important observation, and in general well founded, is much exaggerated.² He also greatly overestimated the danger which the poet would have incurred had he expressed religious skepticism, especially in the veiled and subtle way characteristic of him. This inclines us the less to read far-reaching meanings into the few skeptical passages we find.

¹ The chief difference is his gentleness toward the seculars compared with the regulars, which certainly harmonizes with Wyclif's attitude. This is mainly in the *Prolog*, for they do not fare very well in the *Reeve's* and the *Canon's Yeoman's Tales*. I have spoken already of the striking resemblances in detail between Chaucer's and Wyclif's strictures on the clergy, especially the regulars; Chaucer's flairs may be paralleled again and again in Wyclif's censures. But some of the same charges may be found elsewhere, and of course were based on facts known to both. There is a thesis called *Der Klerus im mittlenglischen Versroman*, by Richard Kahle (Strassburg, 1906), which throws less light on the historical side of the subject than might be anticipated.

² For example, I have shown elsewhere that Chaucer held much the same view as to the validity of astrology and magic that was held by his contemporaries; and that such doubt and distaste as he expresses is sometimes based on religious grounds. Therefore such passages (as those in the *Franklin's Tale*) are no better an argument for skepticism than they are for orthodoxy. See *The Scene of the Franklin's Tale Visited*, pp. 22-37, especially pp. 34-35. The natural background of skepticism for an intellectually independent Englishman of the late fourteenth century is Wycliffism.

Chaucer was neither a denier nor a devotee. He mused often on questions, such as the origin of evil and the control of the universe over the individual's destiny, for which the usual answer in his day was a religious one; his musings were without result, but show what in our day would be felt as a not irreligious nature. Toward the church he was critical, though not unusually so, and he was probably not unsympathetic to the concrete criticism directed at her by other vigorous and earnest souls of his day. We have no reason to doubt that he went to mass at least on Sundays and holy days, and to confession and communion at least once a year; and that at the hour of death he would have been disturbed if he had missed absolution, unction, and the viaticum.¹ We cannot affirm that all this is so; but it is what is to be supposed of the sort of man he appears to have been.²

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

¹ There is evidence in the Retractions at the end of the *Parson's Tale* (ll. 1081-92) that late in life he was at least conventionally submissive to even the narrower religious spirit of his time. In writing them he was following what might almost be called a literary-religious custom of earlier periods, and the impulse which produced them has often been paralleled among later literary men. See *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXVIII, 521-29.

² Chaucer is not greatly given to ecclesiastical language. Occasionally the terms of theology and of the liturgies appear, especially in the *Troilus* (the cases cited not being in its original). Pandarus taunts Troilus with having "caught attrition" (the minimum degree of repentance in a good confession, opposed to contrition; *T.C.*, I, 557); twice Chaucer contrasts substance and accidents (*T.C.*, IV, 1505; *Pard. T.*, 539). He refers to the form of confession (the *Confiteor*), when Pandarus bids Troilus (I, 932) beat his breast and beg pardon for speaking against love, and when Pandarus says he overheard Troilus say, "'*Mea culpa*, lord! I me repente'" (II, 525). A line in the poem of the *Troilus*, "For I, that god of Loves servants serve" (I, 15, *servus servorum dei amoris*, as it were), may be playing on the papal style used at the beginning of bulls and other especially formal missives ("Benedictus episcopus, servus servorum Dei"; Dante thus alludes to the pope, "il servo de' servi," *Inf.*, XV, 112). Skeat refers *A B C*, 81, to the *Stabat mater dolorosa*; a little farther on there may be a reminiscence of the *Dies irae* if it was sufficiently familiar in Chaucer's day. It was not sung then in masses for the dead as the sequence (between the epistle and the gospel), as in the modern Roman rite, where it first appeared in the fifteenth century (Rock, *Church of Our Fathers*, 2d ed., IV, 204-5; *Missale Romanum*, 1474, Bradshaw Soc., II, 293).

But, for your bothes peynes, I you preye,
Lat not our alder foo make his bobounce,
That he hath in his listes mischaunce
Convict that ye bothe have bought so dere

Quaerens me sedisti lassus,
Redimisti crucem passus,
Tantus labor non sit cassus.

The Wife of Bath at the beginning of her tale (ll. 869 ff.) ridicules friars' services of benediction (Wyclif also speaks of such things with contempt). King Alla's submitting himself to the pope for penance and his going to Rome (*M.L.T.*, pp. 988 ff.) doubtless refers to the practice of "reserving" certain sins to the pope. But this is the same in the French original of the poem. For more on this matter see Brown in *Mod. Phil.*, IX, 1 ff., and *Miracle of our Lady* (Chaucer Soc., 1910), 120 ff.; Tupper in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXX, 9-11; Young, *ibid.*, 97-99. The title and some of the language (especially in the rubrics) of the *Legend* are ecclesiastical. The *Ave Maria* is mentioned in *ABC*, 104 (not too respectfully, one would almost fancy). The writer will shortly discuss elsewhere the marriage service in *Merch. T.*, 1701-8, 1819. The use of the opening of St. John's Gospel as a charm, etc. (*Prol.*, 254), was discussed in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXIX, 140; other cases are mentioned in Luther's *Tischreden* (Foerstemann's ed.), II, 442; *Lay Folk's Mass Book* (E.E.T.S., 1879), 146, 383-84; Arderne, *Fistula* (*ibid.*, 1910), 104, 135; J. M. Stone, *History of Mary I.* (London, 1901), I, 427.

THE CARDENIO-DOUBLE FALSEHOOD PROBLEM

I

Among the plays attributed to Shakspeare on unsubstantial grounds, *Double Falsehood*, published by Lewis Theobald in 1728, has a peculiar claim to interest because of attempts to identify it with a non-extant drama called "*The History of Cardenio* by Mr. Fletcher and Shakespeare." The latter was entered on the *Stationers' Register* for Humphrey Moseley in 1653, but was probably acted about 1613.¹ Theobald declared that the former was "revised and adapted" from an original written by Shakspeare. Since the plot of *Double Falsehood* is taken from the story of Cardenio in *Don Quixote* through Shelton's translation, and it is naturally supposed that the lost *History of Cardenio* was derived from the same source, there seems a reasonable probability that Theobald had old manuscripts in his possession as he claimed, and that one of these was recorded for Moseley in 1653.

The great difficulty in the way of anyone who would prove or disprove Theobald's assertion arises from his confessed revising and adapting to the needs of the eighteenth-century stage. We do not know to what extent he altered the original, but if he really had an old play to begin with, there is probably so much of his own work in it as it now stands that internal evidences of authorship must be partial and unsatisfactory at best. On the other hand, because of the sale of Theobald's library after his death, it is likely that such manuscripts—if he really had them—were lost. So external evidence, also, seems to be of little value. Many of the scholars who have investigated the problem, however, are of the opinion that *Double Falsehood* is not entirely Theobald's work, even if it is not, as he claimed, by Shakspeare.

¹ "Probably identical with a *Cardenno* acted at court by the King's men in May, 1613, and a *Cardenna* in June, 1613."—Nelson and Thorndike, *The Facts about Shakespeare*, New York, 1913, p. 160. For the full text of Lord Stanhope's item, see W. E. Henley's introduction to the Tudor edition of *Don Quixote*, xlvii (Shelton's tr.), London, 1896.

Mr. Gamaliel Bradford, Jr., in *Modern Language Notes*, 1909,¹ added an interesting article to the literature of the subject, in which he shows that in spite of the changes and obvious revamping of the play, *Double Falsehood* still retains palpable indications of Fletcher's hand and possible traces of another Elizabethan's.

Mr. Bradford's article was answered in *Modern Philology*,¹ by Professor Rudolph Schevill, who tried to show conclusively that *Double Falsehood* was not taken from Shelton's translation at all, but from a novel entitled *The Adventures on the Black Mountains*, in a collection edited by Samuel Croxall in 1729.² Schevill shows that the novel and play parallel each other in the order of events much more closely than either does the original story in Shelton, that the novel contains details of the story common to itself and *Don Quixote* which are not found in the play, and that there seem to be no details common to the original and *Double Falsehood* which are not in *The Adventures* also. From these evidences he concludes that the novel and not Shelton's translation is the source of the play. The apparent chronological difficulty he overcomes by reasoning that since both play and novel were printed by John Watts, Theobald probably saw the manuscript of the latter early enough to base the play upon it. In summary, Professor Schevill says:

Either the play is neither by Fletcher nor Shakespeare, or the play is not taken from *The Adventures on the Black Mountains*. But I have shown that there is a definite relation between the novel and the play, namely that the latter is based upon the former, and thus belongs to the eighteenth century. . . . If it can be asserted that *Double Falsehood* is a slavish dramatization of the novel, it has become unnecessary to insist that there is not the remotest possibility that Theobald had a lost *History of Cardenio* either by Shakespeare or Fletcher as a basis for his play, *Double Falsehood*.

Before making any further attempts to connect *Double Falsehood* with the lost *Cardenio*, it becomes necessary to show that the former does not depend on *The Adventures on the Black Mountains*, for

¹ Gamaliel Bradford, Jr., "The History of Cardenio by Mr. Fletcher and Shakespeare," *MLN*, XXV, 51 ff.; Rudolph Schevill, *Theobald's Double Falsehood? Mod. Phil.*, IX, 285 ff.

² "Select Collection of Novels and Histories in Six Volumes. . . . All New Translated from the Originals, by several eminent Hands, Second edition. London, 1729," I, 313-38. This possible source is also noted by William Jaggard, *Shakespeare Bibliography*, Stratford-on-Avon, 1911, p. 3.

Schevill's case, if sound, seems to preclude any possibility of Elizabethan authorship. As he pointed out, there are some passages common to the novel and *Don Quixote* which are not found in the play. This is evidence beyond doubt that the "translator" of Croxall's version went to Shelton for his main story. But he has overlooked some verbal and phrasal parallels between Shelton and *Double Falsehood* which indicate that the author or authors of the play also went directly to this early translation of Cervantes. For the excerpts given below, notice that the novel has either no parallel passage or one which does not follow Shelton as closely as that from the play.

1. Shelton, IV, i, 2:

How much more grateful companions will these craggies and thickets prove to my designs, by afoording me leisure to communicate my mishaps to heaven with plaints; then that if any mortall man living, since there is none upon earth from whom I may expect counsell in doubts, ease in complaints or in harmes remedie.

Double Falsehood, p. 48:

How much more grateful are these craggy Mountains,
And these wild Trees, than things of nobler Natures,
For these receive my plaints and mourn again
In many Echoes to me. All good People
Are fain asleep forever. None are left,
That have the sense, and Touch of Tenderness
For Virtues sake: No, scarce their Memory:
From whom I may expect Counsel in Fears,
Ease to Complaining, or Redress of Wrongs.

Adventures contains nothing at all.

2. Shelton, IV, i, 3:

This bodie, since it is not Lucinda, can be no human creature, but a divine.

Double Falsehood, p. 49:

Since she is not Leonora, she is heavenly.

Adventures contains nothing of this.

3. Shelton, IV, i, 5 and 11:

Lady, whatsoever you be, stay and fear nothing . . .
 . . . is it possible that you are named Dorothea?

Double Falsehood, p. 50:

Stay, Lady, stay: can it be possible
 That you are Violante?

Adventures, p. 334:

The story teller whom he now recollected to be Dorothea. . . .

4. Shelton, III, xi, 267:

(*Messenger to Cardenio*) . . . For Sir, I know you very well.

Double Falsehood, 23-24:

Leon. Know you Julio, Sir?

Mess. Yes, very well; and love him, too, as well.

Nothing in *Adventures*.

5. Shelton, III, xi, 269:

I carry about with me a poniard secretly, which may hinder more resolute forces by giving an end to my life.

Double Falsehood, p. 29:

Stage direction, *She shows him dagger*. Leonora then threatens to kill herself if Julio does not hide while the wedding takes place.

Adventures contains no mention of dagger until the episode of Leonora's fainting later, details of which are common to all three.

6. The song of Cardenio (Shelton, III, 250) may have suggested a similar lament sung by Violante in *Double Falsehood* (47). There is no song in the novel.

7. Shelton, IV, i, 1:

I esteemed it better to find Don Fernando unmarried than married, presuming that yet the gates of my remedy were not wholly shut . . . heaven had preadventure set that impediment on the second marriage, to make him understand what hee ought to the first:

Double Falsehood, p. 37:

Yet there remains a little Spark of Hope
That lights me to some Comfort. The Match is crossed;
The Parties separate: and I again
May come to see this Man that has betrayed me;
And wound his Conscience for it;

This motive for her following him is not given in *Adventures*. She leaves home "to be lost to her friends."

It must be clear from a comparison of these passages that the original author or authors of *Double Falsehood* not only followed Shelton's translation, but followed it closely in some details of the story. Some of the excerpts of the play, notably the first three listed, are little more than paraphrases of the original. We must conclude, then, that both the translator of *The Adventures* and the authors of *Double Falsehood* went to Shelton for the story of Cardenio.

But how are we going to account for the obvious parity of the two in details not found in Shelton?

The first edition of Croxall's novels and histories (1720-22) was so well received by the public that a second was brought out in 1729 with ten additional selections, one of which was *The Adventures* (see full list in preface to second edition). Of the new tales, this was the only one from Cervantes or a Spanish source, although the first edition probably contained a good number. The three volumes I have seen of the six-volume set contain four, all derived from the *Novelas Exemplares*.¹ These stories from the *novelas* actually are what Croxall professes the entire collection to be—mere translations. The story of Cardenio in *The Adventures*, on the contrary, is considerably changed from the original in Shelton. It is shortened to two-thirds, the order of events is changed, and some details are added, as Schevill himself shows. This is hardly "New Translated from the Original." Such a change in the original Cardenio story would be made rather for a dramatic purpose than for any other.

In view of the similarity in general outlines of *The Adventures* and the play, it seems plausible that while Croxall was planning his second edition he perceived the popularity of *Double Falsehood* as

¹ *The Jealous Extremaduran*, I, 243 ff.; *The Little Gypsy*, V, 1; *The Spanish Lady of England*, VI, 189; *The Lady Cornelia*, VI, 239.

an acted play,¹ recognized its source in Cervantes, and determined to take advantage of the public interest in the story by including it in his new work. Consequently, he (or the "translator," whoever he was) furbished up Shelton, as Shevill says, but did so under the conscious or unconscious influence of the play with which he was familiar. The result of this process Croxall calls on the title-page of the story, "A Tale upon which the Plan of a Posthumous Play, called *Double Falsehood*, was written originally by W. Shakespeare."² Schevill quotes the statement in the preface, which is "This is the novel from which the Plan of a Posthumous Play, written originally by Shakespear, called *Double Falsehood*, was taken," and assumes that the novel referred to is *The Adventures*. Is it not more likely that by "novel" or "tale" Croxall merely referred to the story of Cardenio in *Don Quixote* of which his version purported to be a translation? I find no allusion to any intimacy between Theobald and Croxall such as we should expect if the former was in the habit of looking over the other's manuscripts more than a year before their publication.

There can be little doubt, then, about the immediate source of *Double Falsehood*. But whether it was written, in its original form, soon after the publication of Shelton's translation (1612) as must have been the case with the *History of Cardenio*, or was composed at a much later period, is harder to determine.

II

How does *Double Falsehood* compare with Theobald's acknowledged work?

Owing to the wholesale leveling which Theobald may have effected in revising the play, internal evidence obtained by verse tests must be relative and approximate indeed. Nevertheless, I have applied the tests for feminine endings, run-on lines, and weak and light endings—all of which proved of value in determining Elizabethan authorship—and a few additional tests, with results which appear at least

¹ For the success of *Double Falsehood* on the stage, see *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1824, p. 223; and Genest's *Some Account of the English Stage*, Bath, 1832, III, pp. 203-4.

² "Selection Collection," etc., I, 311.

significant. For this purpose, *The Persian Princess*, *Electra* (a translation), and *Orestes* were most available, works perhaps as representative as any of Theobald's style in blank verse. The first two were written some time before the publication of *Double Falsehood*, the last, two or three years after. Yet note that the three conform to one another more closely in the peculiarities of style I have tabulated than any one of them does to *Double Falsehood*.

	Lines	F. E.	R. O. L.	W. and L. Ends	Fem. Caes. Line Pause
<i>P. Princess</i> (1711).....	1278	20.5	15	.08 (10)	12
<i>Electra</i> (1714).....	1376	16	9	.06 (8)	11
<i>Double Falsehood</i> (1728).....	1447	38.1	18.3	.15 (22)	19.6
<i>Orestes</i> (1731).....	1606	22.6	10	.025 (4)	8*

* I adopted the definitions of the run-on line and the weak and light endings which are found in the report of the St. Petersburg Shakespeare Circle (*Englische Studien*, III, 473 ff.). Only the blank verse was considered, and full lines were counted in every case. *The Perfidious Brother* (1715) was not examined because of the uncertainty as to its authorship. See *Dictionary of National Biography*, LVI, 119.

Mr. Bradford noted in his paper on *Double Falsehood* the frequency of the feminine ending composed of two monosyllabic words—a very remarkable characteristic of Fletcher's style. There are in all 137 such endings in *Double Falsehood*, whereas *Electra* and *Orestes* have 20 and 27 respectively. In the first, 30 different words are given the final unemphatic position, while in *Electra* only 6 and in *Orestes* 7 are thus used. Theobald's range is apparently limited to "it," "me," "them," "him," "you," and "us," only three other words being found in the two plays. In *Double Falsehood*, not only is there a suggestive variety, but "Sir" and "not" are found 11 and 10 times used in this way. Now Fletcher was noticeably fond of these words as endings, and his use of them is exemplified in *The Chances*, written about 1615, where "Sir" is found 22 times and "not" 11 times. In this play, Fletcher uses 39 different final words, with a total of 234 cases. Since a discussion of Fletcherian authorship belongs to another part of this paper, let it suffice here to note that all our figures seem to support Bradford's case. We must admit, at any rate, that whether *Double Falsehood* was the work of Theobald's own pen or not, in these particulars it shows an appreciable variance from his earlier and later styles.

III

Are there internal evidences of two styles?

Bradford, who thinks so, assigns II, iii; IV (except about fifty lines near the beginning); and V (except a small portion which he does not define) to Fletcher. He believes the remainder shows occasional traces of the most masterful Elizabethan hand, although he admits that for the most part it is far below the poetic or dramatic quality of Shakspeare. I have based my tests on Bradford's division.

A graphic representation with one line to indicate the number of feminine endings in each ten verses and another to show the run-on lines reveals such a perceptible change of manner as he has suggested at the beginning of Act III, scene iii. Feminine endings are more frequent after this point and run-on lines noticeably less common. Whatever evidence is thus furnished of a dual authorship receives support from the other tests I made.

	Parts Possibly by Fletcher	By Another
Lines	754	693
Feminine endings	44.2	32
Run-on lines	15.2	21.5
Weak and light endings39 (3)	2.7 (19)
Feminine caesural line pauses	16	13.3
Mid-stopped speeches	30	44.5*

* Bradford finds 47 per cent of feminine endings in the Fletcher part. Since he does not state definitely how much of Act V he considers Fletcher's, I have been able to follow his division only approximately.

The parts by Fletcher show a larger percentage of feminine endings. In the other peculiarities of style, the remaining parts predominate, especially in the weak and light endings. Nineteen to three is a very significant difference.

If these figures make it evident that there is a real difference of style in the two parts of *Double Falsehood* as Bradford has distinguished them, they serve to demonstrate even more clearly and effectively the difference between Theobald's acknowledged work and the play under discussion. It seems hardly possible that the portion of the latter which contains 44.2 per cent of feminine endings was composed in 1727 by the same hand that wrote *Orestes* three years later with only 22.6 per cent. Nor does it appear any more likely

that the first part of *Double Falsehood* which contains 19 weak and light endings was written by the same author as the play of 1730 in which there are only 4 altogether. In the same way we may compare the 10 per cent of run-on lines in Theobald's *Orestes* with the 21.6 per cent in *Double Falsehood*. Perhaps other figures are unnecessary to show that the latter is not like the avowed works of Theobald, and that there are in it traces of two manners of writing.

The weak and light endings which we noted above as frequent in the first part of *Double Falsehood*, were so characteristic of Shakspeare's later style that they suggest another line of inquiry.

IV

Does internal evidence support the possibility that the original of *Double Falsehood* was identical with the *History of Cardenio*, written by Shakspeare and Fletcher about 1613?

Nearly all scholars now believe that Shakspeare and Fletcher were joint authors of *Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Henry VIII*, and that these plays were written about this time. I have made a comparison of the parts assigned each author with the parts of *Double Falsehood* using for this purpose the division of *Two Noble Kinsmen* which is to be found in *The Facts about Shakespeare* (p. 160) and the partition of *Henry VIII* employed by Thorndike in his *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*.¹ The results appear in the table on p. 278.

Notice that the three columns of figures correspond in a general way. That is, the three percentages of feminine endings in the upper half of the table are smaller than the three in the lower half, and the percentages representing the frequency of run-on lines in the lower half are in each case smaller than those above. The difference is always in the right direction. The percentages of weak and light endings correspond most noticeably. In *Double Falsehood*, the proportion of feminine endings for the second part has more significance than would appear from the figure 44.2, for in several

¹ The division of Neilson and Thorndike is based upon that of Littledale (*Two Noble Kinsmen*: *N.S.S. Trans.*, series 2, part 15), and assigned I (28 ff.), II; III, iii-; IV; and V, i (1-17), ii, iii (104) ff. to Fletcher. Thorndike's division of *Henry VIII* is adapted from that of James Spedding (*N.S.S. Trans.*, 1874; Appendix, p. 14) and gives I, iii, iv; II, i, ii; III, i, ii b; IV; and V, ii-v, to Fletcher.

individual scenes this rises to 50 per cent. To be sure, we should reasonably expect a percentage of more than 21.5 of run-on lines in the former part of *Double Falsehood* if Shakspeare wrote it, but since Theobald's own average—as far as I can learn from his plays—was between 10 and 15 per cent, this reduction in the number of un-stopped lines would be a natural consequence of his revision. A consistent leveling such as the figures in the table indicate is just what we should expect to find in a play which had survived the revisions of Theobald and nobody knows how many other editors.

	<i>Double Falsehood</i>	PARTS ASSIGNED TO SHAKSPEARE	
		<i>T. N. K.</i>	<i>Henry VIII</i>
Lines	693	883	1,077
Feminine endings	32	21.5	28
Run-on lines	21.5	52	54.6
W. and light endings	2.7	8.15	10.8
Mid-stopped speeches	44.5	64	68.5

	<i>Double Falsehood</i>	PARTS ASSIGNED TO FLETCHER	
		<i>T. N. K.</i>	<i>Henry VIII</i>
Lines	754	1,510	1,447
Feminine endings	44.2	62	58
Run-on lines	15.2	25.8	26
W. and light endings39	23	.22
Mid-stopped speeches	30	48	51

A study of the words in *Double Falsehood* does not seem to be of any great value, and considering how much Theobald may have "adapted" it, this is not surprising. Yet I have found less than a dozen words that are too modern in sense to be used in a drama of Fletcher's. More important than this, it seems to me, is a study of Fletcher's sources. Miss Hatcher finds that ten of the plays in which he had a hand were taken from stories of Cervantes.¹ A comparison of these with their sources shows that the originals were used in somewhat the same way the story of Cardenio is here, except of course that *Double Falsehood* reveals little of Fletcher's sprightly invention. The dramatist was using material from Cervantes at about the time

¹ Miss O. L. Hatcher, *John Fletcher: A Study in Dramatic Method*, Chicago, 1905, p. 48.

the *History of Cardenio* must have been written. *Love's Pilgrimage* (1614?), *The Chances* (1615), and possibly *The Coxcomb* (1609-13), are examples of this fact. So it seems more than probable that the entry of Humphrey Moseley in the *Register* assigned the lost play correctly to Fletcher, at least, if not to Shakspeare.

A few other details ought to be noticed in passing. If Theobald really had an old manuscript of the *History of Cardenio*, he must have shortened it a great deal, for *Double Falsehood* is little more than half as long as many Elizabethan plays of the period under discussion. Verbal and phrasal parallels, on the other hand, such as those listed above from *Don Quixote* and *Double Falsehood*, are common between plays and their sources in Elizabethan times. I find similar parallels in *Two Noble Kinsmen* and the *Knightes Tale*, in *Henry VIII* and Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*, in *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Two Damsels*, and in *The Chances* and *The Lady Cornelia*. The hearse trick (invading the convent by means of a fake funeral procession, and abducting Leonora) probably needs no other sources than the suggestions furnished by two incidents in other parts of *Don Quixote*, one in Book II, chap. v, and another near the end of the first part.

The line in *Double Falsehood* (III, i, 17), "None but itself can be its parallel," which Pope construed wittily into a weapon against Theobald, has several analogues. It may have found its way into *Double Falsehood* as a reminiscence of Seneca's *Hercules Furens* or of Massinger's *Duke of Milan*. In the former case it might well have been the work of an Elizabethan author. This work of Seneca's seems to have had an important influence on Shakspeare in particular.¹ Yet we know that Theobald had an exceptional familiarity with the classics.

It seems probable that the *Cardenio Double Falsehood* problem will never be solved to our complete satisfaction until more external

¹ J. W. Cunliffe, *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*, London, 1893, pp. 18 ff. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1780, p. 507, for discussion. The line referred to in *Hercules Furens* is "Quæris Alcidae parem? Nemo est nisi ipse" (84-85). In Massinger, it is

Her goodness doth distain comparison.
And, but herself, admits no parallel.

—*Duke of Milan*, IV, iii.

It is worth nothing that Pope's version, "None but himself can be his parallel" (*Pope's Works*: ed. of Elwin and Courthope, 1886, X, 364), is closer to the lines of Seneca and Massinger. Both in Cassell's *Book of Quotations*, London, 1913, and Bartlett's famous work in all editions, Pope's line is attributed to Theobald.

evidence is brought to bear upon it. The small number of female parts in the play (two, except for a maid who speaks two lines), the source in Cervantes, the close verbal relation with the original in Shelton, and some other details, in a general way link it to the drama of the Elizabethans. But the shortness of it, the lifeless verse, some of the language, and the distinctly inferior dramatic quality are strong arguments against its being the work of Shakspeare or Fletcher either. We do not know how much Theobald revised, of course, but as a lover of Shakspeare, he would not be likely to make any more changes than he thought absolutely necessary. It is not impossible, on the other hand, that the manuscripts were revised several times before they reached him. The history of the *History of Cardenio* might make an interesting and enlightening chapter.

But speculation is futile. Internal evidence, as we have seen, gives no very conclusive results. From these investigations, however, the following facts seem to be established: (1) The immediate source of *Double Falsehood* was Shelton's *Don Quixote*. (2) The style of the play as a whole, and the second part in particular, differs appreciably from Theobald's acknowledged work. (3) There are unmistakable evidences of two styles. (4) These distinct styles show a general similarity to those in *Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Henry VIII*, which are now recognized as belonging to Shakspeare and Fletcher.

WALTER GRAHAM

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE SCIENTIST AS A COMIC TYPE

In the chapter entitled "The Progress of Science," contributed to the *Cambridge History of English Literature* by Mr. A. E. Shipley, there is the following summary characterizing the scientist as he appeared in comedy: "To the play-writer of the time [the age of Dryden], the man of science or pseudo-science was a vague, peevish pedant, much occupied with physiognomies, dreams, and fantastic ideas as to the properties and powers of various substances."¹ The sentence was evidently written without a full knowledge of the comic type of the period, certainly with no first-hand knowledge of the new scientific humor that was born of and nurtured by the Royal Society. It is the purpose of this paper, therefore, to show how a new type came into comedy that was far different from the "vague, peevish pedant" of alchemy, astrology, and witchcraft.

The period from 1660 to 1700 saw the rise of the new science, or experimental philosophy, based on the inductive method of Sir Francis Bacon. The founding of the science was due to the untiring efforts of a small group of men in and about London, who banded themselves together to study the "New Philosophy," "not meddling with Divinity, Metaphysicks, Moralls, Politicks, Grammar, Rhetoric, or Logic."² Among these early scientists the most noted were Wilkins, Wallis, Boyle, Hooke, Barrow, Sloane, and Newton. It was they who established the Royal Society and ambitiously undertook to reconstruct the natural history of the world.

It may be well in the beginning to distinguish the purpose and the method of the experimental philosophers from those of the pseudo-scientists of alchemy, astrology, and witchcraft. The alchemists were ever in search of the Philosopher's Stone; they wanted to discover some cheap and easy way to transmute the baser metals to gold. Such men were not an unfamiliar sight in the London of the age of Dryden.³ The astrologers were still preying upon the

¹ *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VIII, 419.

² John Wallis, Letter to the Royal Society, 1696.

³ Cf. Ashmole's *Theatrum Chymicum*, and Hathaway's *The Alchemist*, Introduction.

credulity of the ignorant with their prognostications and fortune-telling.¹ Witchcraft continued to have believers even among the learned who refused to apply common sense to the strange tales that ran from lip to lip.² But the new scientists early adopted a motto which was a challenge to every pseudo-science of the day: *nullius in verba*. "No arguments are received as cogent, no principles allowed as current, but what in themselves are intelligible," wrote William Wotton, a Fellow of the Society and a staunch defender of the new faith.³ "This Society will not own any Hypothesis, System, or doctrine of the Principles of Naturall Philosophy, proposed or mentioned by Philosopher ancient or modern, nor the explication of any phenomena whose recourse must be had to the original causes (as not being explicable by Heat, Cold, Weight, Figure, and the like, as Effects produced thereby)," declared the professional experimenter of the Society.⁴ Everything was to be examined anew, "all Systems, Theories, Principles, Hypotheses, Elements, Histories, and Experiments of Things, Naturall and Mechanical, invented, recorded, or practiced, by any considerable author ancient or modern."⁵ The foundations of the new philosophy were to be laid strong and deep in countless experiments, out of which should rise into definition a solid mass of new truth. No authority was to be convincing because it was old; no conclusions were to be scouted because they were new.

The Society found royal favor and succeeded in making experimenting popular. Charles II had a laboratory built in Whitehall, which Pepys visited.⁶ "It was almost necessary to the character of a fine gentleman to have something to say about air-pumps and telescopes."⁷ Membership in the Society increased rapidly; in 1663 there were 131 Fellows.⁸ Its fame spread through the social circles of London, so that the city was filled with ballads when the well-known Duchess of Newcastle attended one of its meetings.⁹ A need

¹ Cf. Swift's *Partridge Papers*.

² Cf. Glanvill's *Essay VI and Sadducismus Triumphatus*.

³ *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, p. 364.

⁴ Hooke's MS Papers, quoted by Weld, *History of the Royal Society*, p. 146.

⁵ Hooke's MS Papers, quoted by Weld, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

⁶ Cf. *Diary*, May 30, 1667.

⁷ Macaulay, *History of England*, I, 376.

⁸ MS List of Fellows, British Museum MS 4442.

⁹ *Pepys' Diary*, May 30, 1667.

was felt for a permanent record of the Society's activities, and the secretary, Henry Oldenburg, was authorized to prepare a transcript of all papers, a review of all new books of interest to science, and to describe the experiments performed before the members at their meetings. The secretary followed these instructions and published in March, 1655, the first copy of the *Philosophical Transactions*, a publication which has continued to this day the official organ of the Royal Society.

It is not strange, therefore, that, with the rise of this new antagonistic scientific interest, the old pseudo-science should fade out of the comedies. Such characters as Mopus in the *Cheats* (1662), the two astrologers in the Prologue to Dryden's *The Wild Gallant* (1663), the "Mock Astrologer" in Dryden's *An Evening's Love* (1665), the "Mock Doctor" in Lacy's *The Dumb Lady* (1672) were really out of date and already conventionalized. The pseudo-sciences had not disappeared, to be sure, witness Ashmole's *Theatrum Chymicum*, Swift's *Partridge Papers*, and the astrologers, Lilly, Evans, Captain Bubb, Jeffrey Neve, and Dr. Ardee, but the new scientific attitude was opposed to such beliefs.

One of the earliest characters in comedy that has any direct connection with the interest of the new scientists is Veterano in Shackerley Marmion's *The Antiquary* (1641). The name of the play is taken from this character, whose "affects, spirits, and powers, in their confluxions, all run one way" toward antiquarian research. But antiquarianism in comedy meant simply a foolish curiosity about "rarities." Veterano is thus characterized by his nephew, Lionel, who has designs upon the old man's money: "He is grown obsolete, and 'tis time he were out of date. They say he sits all day in contemplation of a statue with ne'er a nose, and doats on decays with greater love than the self-loved Narcissus did on his beauty."¹ False antiques, of course, are palmed off on this old man; he is represented as a despicable fool, the gull and dupe of everyone. He is in truth a "vague, peevish pedant," but he has little or nothing in common with the new scientists except the interest in things ancient.²

Under the name of Oldlove, Veterano reappeared in Thomas Durfey's comedy, *Madam Fickle* (1677). He is still the worshiper

¹ *The Antiquary*, Act I, scene 1.

² Cf. Birch's *History of the Royal Society*, I, 64.

of antiquity, still stupidly gullible; he is not respected nor is he worthy of respect. "Is there anything," he asks, "more pleasant than antiquities? The Knowledge of the distinction of the Ages, or the deeds and manners of the Ancients, I say, is there anything more pleasant?"¹ Almost a century later, practically the same character was revived as Sir Matthew Mite, in Foote's comedy, *The Nabob* (1773). Eight years later, he appeared once more as the hero of John O'Keefe's *Modern Antiques* (1791). These characters are all cut after the same pattern; they are all old, wealthy, noble—or pretend to be—men who waste their money in a foolish manner on "modern antiques." While they have an interest in common with the new scientists, they could have found no place among them. These characters were only an old Jonsonian humor pensioned in dotage.²

The first new scientist appeared on the comic stage in Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* (1676). According to Langbaine, "no man ever undertook to discover the Frailties of such Pretenders to this kind of Knowledge before Mr. Shadwell." The author himself lays claim to originality in his characterization:

In this are Fools, that much infest the town,
Plenty of Fops, Grievances of this Age,
Whose nauseous Figures ne'er were on the Stage.³

The name of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack soon became attached to all manner of scientific apparatus, and was synonymous for years with scientific crankism.⁴

What manner of man he was may be clearly seen from the comments made upon him by the other characters in the play. Snarl, the cynic, says of him: "My nephew is such a coxcomb, he has study'd these twenty years about the nature of Lice, Spiders, and Insects."⁵ His friend, Sir Samuel Formal, rhetorician, asserts: "He is an enemy to wit as all Virtuoso's are."⁶ Clarinda calls him a "sot that has spent twenty thousand pounds in Microscopes, to find out the Nature of Eels in Vinegar, Mites in Cheese, and the

¹ Act III, scene 1.

² A Society of Antiquaries had been organized in 1576. The new scientists were commonly known as "virtuosoes."

³ The Prologue.

⁴ *The Virtuoso*, Act I, scene 1.

⁵ Cf. *The Number*, 216.

⁶ *Ibid.*

Blue of Plums."¹ "One who has broken his Brains," adds Miranda, "about the Nature of Maggots, who has study'd these twenty years to find out the Spots of a Spider, and never cared for understanding Mankind."² Longvil, who has some reason to denounce him, declares: "I would rather be a Trumpeter to a Monster, and call the Rabble to see a Calf with six Legs, than such a Blockhead."³

Sir Nicholas first appears in the second act of the comedy, in his laboratory, "a spacious Room, where all his Instruments and fine knick-knacks are." The scientific apparatus includes microscopes, telescopes, thermometers, barometers, "pneumatick Engynes, stentrophonical Tubes." Fragments of dead insects lie scattered about the room and special colonies of live ones are crawling about in the corners. As the scene opens Sir Nicholas is discovered in the midst of one of his ridiculous experiments; he is learning to swim by lying on the table and imitating the motions of a frog in a dish of water in front of him. "A most compendious method," announces Sir Samuel Formal, "that in a fortnight, has advanced him to be the best swimmer of Europe. Nay, it were possible to swim with any fish of his inches."⁴

Longvil: Have you ever tried in Water, Sir?

Sir Nicholas: No, Sir. But I swim most excellently on land.

Bruce: Do you intend to practice in the Water, Sir?

Sir Nicholas: Never, Sir, I hate Water. I never come upon the Water, Sir.

Longvil: Then there will be no use of swimming.

Sir Nicholas: I content myself with the Speculative Part of Swimming. I care not for the Practick. I seldom bring anything to Use; 'tis not my Way. Knowledge is my ultimate End.⁵

There were many experiments to follow. There was a transfusion of blood, a dissection of a "Chichester Lobster," the bottling of fine upland country air to be stored in the cellar of the city house like wine, the eclipsing of the "light of rotten wood" in a vacuum, the testing of the magic properties of may-dew, the study of the habits of insects, the observation of the world in the moon through the telescope, the invention of a wonderful speaking trumpet, the mastery of the art of flying. These are the things that occupy the mind

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, Act II, scene 1.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

of the new scientist. He is not peevish nor vague, but he is pedantic to an extreme degree. He has taken the whole realm of knowledge to be his province, to be investigated for the theoretical principles underlying it. He is busied, not with "physiognomies, dreams, and fantastic ideas as to the properties and powers of various substances," but with experiments in chemistry, in physics, in zoölogy, in astronomy, and with inventions.

The source of material for these experiments is largely the *Philosophical Transactions*. Nearly all of Shadwell's allusions and much of his phraseology may be traced to the reports of experiments by members of the Royal Society, published in the *Transactions* a short time before the presentation of *The Virtuoso*. For instance, witness Swammerdam's letter, October 26, 1667, and the experiments of Robert Hooke, October 24, 1667, on respiration; on the transfusion of blood, witness the report for May 6, 1667, and the experiments of Drs. Lower and King at the Arundel House, November 16, 1666; on the study of spiders and tarantulas, witness a discussion by I. Wray, "On Spiders," and a review of S. W. Senguerdus' *De Tarantula*;¹ on "Eels in Vinegar," witness Leeuwenhoek's letter from Delft, April 21, 1676; on glow-worms, witness Robert Boyle's report, February 15, 1672; on speaking trumpets, witness drawing and explanation by Sir Samuel Moreland, in *Philosophical Transactions*, January 27, 1672. On the art of flying there was the well-known book by Dr. Wilkins, *The Discoverer of a New World; or a Discourse Tending to prove that 'tis Probable there may be another Habitable World in the Moon* (1638). In Lord Worcester's *Century of Inventions* (1655), No. 77 reads, "How to make a Man Fly; which I have tried with a little Boy of ten years old in a Barn, from one end to the other, on a Hay-mow."² It is clear, therefore, that Shadwell simply "crammed up" his scientific facts for this comic character. Even a cursory reading shows that he consciously and wantonly garbled the facts from the *Transactions*.

But these are facts gleaned from the observations of the new philosophers, the experimental scientists, not from astrologers, alchemists, or witchmongers. These are the facts, treated after the

¹ *Philosophical Transactions*, III, 660.

² Cf. also, Anthony a Wood's *Athen. Oxon.*, II, col. 969; Hooke's *Micrographia*, Preface, p. 19.

manner of satiric comedy, which led to the great discoveries of the period—the law of gravitation, the compressibility of air, the analysis of light, the discovery of bacilli, etc. It will be observed that they deal not with “physiognomies, dreams,” and only rarely, as in the case of may-dew, with “the fantastic properties and powers of substances.” These are the facts of nature burlesqued.

Vagueness and peevishness are not points of satire in the character of Sir Nicholas. He is in fact too assertive, too sanguine, too optimistic about his researches and their importance. But he is a pedant. The knowledge which he professes is all bluff. The essential point, however, lies in this claim of the satirist that such knowledge, if possessed, would be of no use to mankind. This is indeed the essence of all the criticism on the new scientific interest. “This foolish virtuoso does not consider that one Bricklayer is worth forty Philosophers.”¹ “So it is knowledge, ’tis no matter of what.”² And this, the greatest virtuoso of them all, had not invented “even so much as a Mousetrap or an Engyne to pare Cheese with.”³

Furthermore, it was convincing evidence of a mean, despicable character or a cracked brain to be interested in “mean, despicable creatures, such as Spiders, ants, lice, and other vermin,” to the exclusion of society and politics. To use learned language would not dignify the interest; it was essentially low and vulgar. There was no standard of comparison known to Shadwell to show how far beneath the interest and importance of the ballroom was the laboratory, how much more befitting a man were the intrigues of social life than the knowledge of the habits of insects, how much more learning abounded in a coffeehouse than in the lonely study.

This is the type of the new scientist as comedy first found him. He follows the inductive experimental method announced by Sir Francis Bacon, and strives to accomplish the purpose of scientific study as proposed by him, viz., to reconstruct the natural history of the world. His conclusions may be too largely speculative, he may bring nothing to the “practick” in comedy, but his prototype in real life was neither a charlatan nor a fool. The man of the new science as the playwrights misrepresented him, was a fool, because

¹ *The Virtuoso*, Act IV, scene 1.

² *Ibid.*, Act III, scene 1.

³ *Ibid.*, Act V, scene 1.

he was engaged in the vain pursuit of useless knowledge, a pedant, because he was a mere pretender to learning, and a generally despicable character, because he was wholly absorbed in a low, vulgar interest outside the social realm of London society folk. "'Tis below a Virtuoso to trouble himself with Men and Manners. I study Insects.'"¹

The new scientific humor reappeared frequently in comedy. In Shadwell's *Sullen Lovers* (1688), Lady Vaine Knowall, who prides herself on her mercurial temperament, lays claim to being a "virtuosa";² but this is only a claim. She is a mere "she-pedant," with no discoveries to proclaim, no experiments to perform. Lady Maurice, in Thomas Wright's *The Female Virtuoso* (1693-97), is much more of a "virtuosa" than Lady Vaine Knowall. Her head is filled with "projects." "I was yesterday with my Lord Mayor, to communicate to him a Mathematical Engine of my own, to keep the streets as clean, and as dry as a drawing Room all the year around."³ Lovewit, in the same play, has a huge limbec in the process of manufacture "to extract the quintessence of all plays, to sell drop by drop to poets of this age."⁴ Catchat, likewise, has recently discovered "three Men in the Moon fighting a duel in a Church-yard," and is now engaged in teaching a flea to sing. "The little Creature," says she, "understands notes already; and if I live, she shall sing a song in the next opera that's acted."⁵

The best representative of the female virtuoso and a fit consort for Sir Nicholas Gimcrack, is Valeria in Mrs. Centlivre's *The Basset-Table* (1706). She is "a Daughter run mad after Philosophy." At her first appearance, she dashes upon the stage in the mad pursuit of a huge flesh-fly, which she has just received for vivisection.

Lady Reveller: I am glad the poor Fly escaped; will you never be weary of these Whimsies?

Valeria: Whimsies! Natural Philosophy a Whimsy! Oh the unlearned World!

Lady Reveller: Ridiculous Learning!

¹ *The Virtuoso*, Act II, scene 1.

² "Madam, d'ye think I, that am a Virtuosa, understand no better than to leave you, now you are not well?"—*Sullen Lovers*, Act II, scene 2.

³ Act II, scene 1.

⁴ Act IV, scene 2.

⁵ *The Female Virtuoso*, Act III, scene 1.

Alpiew: Ridiculous indeed for women. Philosophy suits our Sex as Jack-Boots do. . . .

Lady Reveller: My Stars! This girl will be mad, that's certain.

Valeria: Mad! So Nero banished Philosophers from Rome, and the first Discoverer of the Antipodes was condemned for a heretic.¹

A bluff sea-captain, designed by Valeria's whimsical father for her husband, is announced in this fashion:

Servant: Madam, here's Sir Richard, and a . . .

Valeria: A what, is it an Accident, a Substance, a Material Being, or a Being of Reason?

Servant: I don't know what you call a Material Being, it is a man.

Valeria: Pshaw, a Man, that's Nothing.

Lady Reveller: She'll prove by and by out of Descartes that we are all Machines.²

Valeria's wits have all run to experiments; she can talk of nothing except her discoveries and investigations. "I would ask of you, Sir, if you had the curiosity to inspect a Mermaid? Or if you are convinced there is a world in every Star. We by our Telescopes, find Seas, Groves, and Plains, and all that; but what they are peopled with, that's the quere."³ She, like Sir Nicholas, is shown in her laboratory,⁴ with a fish ready for dissection. She exclaims over the circulation of blood through its tail; she exhibits to the admiring Lovely, her suitor, the joint-worm, the *Lambricus Laetus*, which she has found "in opening a Dog the other Day." She asserts that "animals, insects, and reptiles can be put to no nobler use than to improve our knowledge."⁵ She dissects her pet pigeon to refute the "vulgar error" that doves have no gall; she is familiar with the Cartesian and new scientific nomenclature; she makes eager inquiry of travelers concerning marvels in foreign lands. In a word, she is a thoroughgoing new scientist.

There were other characters of the same ilk, but they do not show any new traits. Periwinkle, one of the four guardians of Mrs. Lovely in *A Bold Stroke for a Wife* (1718), is a man given over to a search for odd knowledge and a love for "rarities." Sophronia, in *The Refusal; Or, The Ladies Philosophy* (1721), is described as a "Female Philosophic Saint," who proves to be merely a conventional "she-pedant." There is Fossil, in Gay's *Three Hours After Marriage*

¹ *The Basset-Table*, Act II, scene 1.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

(1721), a "physician interested in rarities." There is Lady Science, in James Miller's *The Humours of Oxford* (1726), who is called by her niece, "Lady Gimcrack," and who is almost always "in an universal Fermentation" of scientific pedantry. There is, finally, the contrast between the false scientific pedant and the true scientific scholar in *The State of Physic* (1742). Dr. Mody is "a Physician of Note, formal, and pretending to Learning"; Dr. Easy is a sentimental hero, in type, modest and trustworthy, who has taken the great "new philosopher," Sydenham, for his model.

It was thus that the scientific humor found exploitation in the comedies of the period from the founding of the Royal Society to the middle of the eighteenth century, when science had reached an honorable position among the intellectual interests of men. While the old pseudo-sciences lingered on the stage as well as in the by-ways of life, they had lost their fresh appeal and were conventionalized. A new kind of material, as has been seen, was discovered by the play-writers—material drawn for comic uses directly from life. The virtuoso, a new scientist, was created to represent the new material. He quickly transplanted the older type. There was, to be sure, the accusation of pedantry and of pseudo-science leveled against him also, but alchemy, astrology, and witchcraft were not among his interests.¹

This new type was definitely the experimental philosopher, not a "vague, peevish pedant," not "much occupied with physiognomies, dreams, and fantastic ideas as to the properties and powers of various substances," but busied with observation and experimentation, with investigation, with the reconstruction of the natural history of the world. The accusation of pedantry was a convention inherited by the writers of comedy of this period, but the satiric thrust contained in the meanness and uselessness of such knowledge is their own. Sir Nicholas Gimcrack admits that he has never made anything so useful as a mousetrap or an engine to pare cheese with. "The Dressing-Room, and not the Study," says Gainlove, "is the Lady's Province—and a Woman makes as ridiculous a Figure, poring over Globes, or through a Telescope, as a Man would with a Pair of

¹ Cf. the attitude in Shadwell's *Lancashire Witches* (1682) and Addison's *The Drummer* (1715).

Preserves mending Lace."¹ "Study your Country's Good, Mr. Periwinkle," advises Mrs. Lovely, "and not her insects."² The antiquarian humor wasted good money; scientific study cracked the brains of men and made women unfit for wives; the character of the individual became as mean and despicable as the objects it studied.

It follows, therefore, that the characterization of the scientist of the age of Dryden as "a vague, peevish pedant, much occupied with physiognomies, dreams, and fantastic ideas as to the properties and powers of various substances," is not accurate. It does not take into consideration the wholly new type, drawn from the new interest of the time. This new type has been found in Sir Nicholas Gimcrack and his followers, male and female. They are the comic presentation of the new experimental philosophy.

C. S. DUNCAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ *The Humours of Oxford*, Act V, scene 1.

² *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, Act III, scene 1.

SOME NOTES ON MANKIND—Concluded

In l. 155, Nought addresses Mercy as "jentyll Jaffrey." I have found two instances of the "slang" use of the name "Geoffrey" in two different senses. One is in Awdeley's *The XXV Orders of Knaves*, of the sixteenth century: "Jeffery Gods Fo is he, that wil sweare & maintaine othes. This is such a lying knaue that none wil beleue him, for the more he sweareth, ye les he is to be beleued."¹ The other is in a Latin poem belonging to the reign of Henry III, in T. Wright's *Political Songs of England from the Reign of John to That of Edward II* (Camden Society), pp. 49-50. Here the name is explained as being equivalent to "jo frai," that is, "I will do it," and as meaning a slow, listless man who is always procrastinating. Geoffrey is one of four brothers, Robert, Richard, Gilbert, and Geoffrey; and a part of the description of the four is contained in the following quatrain:

Robertus excoriat, extorquet, et minatur;
Et Ricardus retinet totum quod lucratur;
Gilebertus decipit, et inde gloriatur;
Galfridus se procrastinat, et nil operatur.

In the *Manual of Sins*, preserved in a manuscript of the late fifteenth century, a Latin quatrain, beginning "Robertus excoriat torquet et minatur," occurs in a description of four typical "executours of pe new facion"—Richard, Robert, Geoffrey, and Gilbert.² Mr. Herbert in his account of the *Manual* gives only the first line of the quatrain, but it is undoubtedly the same as the one in the poem in Wright's collection. The use of the name "Geoffrey" to signify a slow, listless man, a procrastinator, was, therefore, known in the fifteenth century; and this is probably the meaning intended in *Mankind*, when the name is given to Mercy. It will be noted that in l. 255 Now-a-days says to Mercy: "I trow yowur name ys 'do lytyll'; ȝe be so longe fro hom."

¹ *Awdeley's Fraternite of Vacabondes*, etc., ed. E. Viles and F. J. Furnivall (E.E.T.S.), p. 13.

² H. Ward and J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, III, 319-20.

In l. 230, we are told that "Measure is treasure." A poem with this title is included among Lydgate's minor poems in the Percy Society Publications, II, 208. The expression is an old proverb. See J. Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs* (1742), p. 135; F. Seager's "Schoole of Vertue," in *Early English Meals and Manners*, etc., ed. F. J. Furnivall (E.E.T.S.), p. 344, l. 477; Skelton's *Magnyfycence*, ed. R. L. Ramsay (E.E.T.S.), l. 125; "Die Burghsche Cato Paraphrase," ed. Max Förster, in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, ed. L. Herrig and others, CXV, 315; and *Lydgate's Minor Poems*, in Percy Society Publications, II, 82.

To impress upon his rustic audience the necessity of "measure" in eating and drinking, our writer compares the pampered body, which is likely to endanger the welfare of the soul, to an overfed horse, which throws his master into the mire (ll. 234-37). A similar comparison occurs in *A Treatise of Ghostly Battle*, where the horse (the body) is to be restrained by the bridle of Abstinence.¹

In ll. 267-68, Nought says that he has played the fool so long with the "comyn tapster of Bury" that he is very weary. The common tapsters of other towns than Bury were also of doubtful reputation. In 1465 the town council of King's Lynn (one of the towns in the vicinity of which *Mankind* was performed) ordained that "no man within the Towne of Lenne dwellyng fro hens furthward shall kepe nor favour nor mayteyne eny common Tapster with in his house as servaunt or tenaunt, whiche is knowen for a misgoverned woman . . . and also that all suiche comen Tapstres be avoided out of this Towne by Cristemesse even next comyng."²

In ll. 279-81, Mercy says:

Se þe grett pacyence of Iob, & tribulacyon:
lyke as þe smyth trieth ern in þe feer,
So was he triede by Godis vysytacyon.

This figure of trying *iron* by fire is unusual; the common figure, the trying of gold by fire, is the one used by Job himself: "Et probavit me quasi aurum, quod per ignem transit" (Job 23:10). The version in our play may have been due to a careless reading of some such passage as the one in the translations of the *Duodecim Utilitates*

¹ C. Horstman, *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, II, 422.

² *Hist. Mss. Com.*, XI, App. 3, p. 168.

Tribulationis, by Petrus Blesensis, of which there are a number in Middle English: "Do secunde maner of clensyng is thorou whilk metals are clensid, as gold with fire, & ierne with file."¹ (This passage is followed, a few lines later, by the above-mentioned quotation from Job.) A hasty reading of the words, "gold with fire, & ierne with file," could easily give the version used in the play.

In ll. 308-15, Mankind writes on a paper a verse from the Bible, "Memento, homo, quod cinis es, & in cinerem reuerteris." This is done, he says, "to defende me from all superstycyus charmys"; and then he adds, "Lo! I ber on my bryst pe bagge of myn armys."

This apparently means that he has hung the paper about his neck as a charm against evil—specifically, against the wiles of Myscheff and his companions; and has left it hanging outside his gown or jacket. The wearing of verses of Scripture as charms suspended around the neck was a common mediaeval custom. The following passage, censuring the abuse of the practice, is from the *Dialogue of Dives and Pauper*, printed in 1493:

Or use any charmes in gathering of herbes, or hangynge of scrowes aboute man or woman or childe or beest for any seknesse, with any scripture or figures and charects, but if it be pater noster, ave, or the crede, or holy wordes of the Gospel, or of Holy Wryt, for devocion nat for curioustie, and only with the tokene of the holy crosse.²

The paper no doubt bore a cross, as did most of such charms (see the close of the preceding quotation), and this was purposely made large so that the audience might see it readily. It is to this cross, I suppose, instead of to the entire paper, that Mankind refers in l. 315: "Lo! I ber on my bryst pe bagge of myn armys." The "bagge of armys" was the badge worn by the followers of a nobleman,³ it was placed on the breast, back, or sleeve.⁴ Mankind's meaning is that he has now obeyed Mercy's injunction, given in the preceding part of the same scene, and is now "Crystis own knyght" (l. 222). He has become, to use a modern equivalent, a "soldier of the cross."

¹ C. Horstman, *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, II, 49; see also 395.

² Quoted in Brand, *Popular Antiquities* (1888), III, 320; see also other instances cited there.

³ *Promptorium Parvulorum*, Camden Society, I, 20.

⁴ A. C. Fox-Davies, *A Complete Guide to Heraldry*, p. 458.

Ll. 445-46:

Nought. I kan pype in a Walsyngham Wystyll, I, Nought, Nought.
Myscheff. Blow a-pase! & þou xall brynge hym in with a flewte.

Mr. Farmer's note on this passage, which he thinks contains a reference to the Wishing Wells of Walsingham, is not to the point, for it does not explain the *Whistle* at all.¹ I have not found the Walsingham Whistle mentioned anywhere else; and offer the following explanation only as a plausible conjecture.

The name "Walsingham Whistle," I think, was applied to the flute by the country people because it was used by the pilgrims to Walsingham. We know that pilgrims were in the habit of enlivening their journey with music of the bagpipe;² and there is no reason to suppose that flutes and other instruments were not also used for the same purpose. The shrine at Walsingham, in Norfolk, was a favorite place of pilgrimage, and many of the pilgrims would have to pass through the country in which our play was performed. The people of that section, hearing the flutes so frequently, called them Walsingham Whistles—the whistles of the pilgrims to Walsingham. In similar manner, in Norfolk the Galaxia, or Milky Way, was known as the "Walsingham Way."³

"Si dedero," in l. 449, is a popular expression for bribery or buying of favors of any sort. Cf. *Castle of Perseverance*, ll. 878-82; Humanum Genus says:

Coueytyse, as þou wylt, I wyl do.

of Mankynde, getyth no man no good,
 but if he synge "si dedero."

Also Lydgate's version of Aesop's "Wolf and Sheep," in *Anglia*, IX, 8:

Whan a jarroure hath caught savour ones
 To be forsworn, custom makith hym strong,
 "Si dedero" is now so mery a song,
 He hath a practis bi lawe to make a preef,
 To hange a triew man and save an errant thief.

¹ J. S. Farmer, *Lost Tudor Plays*, p. 467.

² Chaucer's *Prologus*, 565-66; and F. W. Galpin, *Old English Instruments of Music*, p. 176.

³ F. Blomefield, *History of Norfolk*, II, 173; IX, 290.

Also a poem from a manuscript of the sixteenth century in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, II, 6; another poem, from a manuscript of the fourteenth century, in *ibid.*, II, 121; *Jack Trueman's Epistle*, in Percy Society Publications, I, 4 (second collection); T. Wright, *Political Songs of England*, p. 324 (Camden Society); Gower's *Vox Clamantis*, Lib. III, ll. 233-34; and C. Horstman, *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, II, 65.

In l. 473, New-gyse declares that he has no money: "I fayll ij farthyngis of an halpeny." Compare this with the more modern expression: "Nipence, nopence, half a groat lacking two pence."¹ Half a groat equals two pence, as half a penny equals two farthings.

In ll. 480-81, Nought likewise declares that his purse is empty:

"Non nobis, domine; non nobis," by sent Deny!
þe deull may daunce in my purse for ony peny!

"Non nobis, domine; non nobis" are the opening words of Ps. 113:1 (second set of verses), given a new interpretation by Nought. With the second line of the quotation cf. the Beggar's speech in Hoccleve's *Regement of Princes*, E.E.T.S., E.S., lxxii, p. 25, ll. 684 ff.:

þe feend, men seyn, may hoppen in a pouche
Whan þat no croys þere-inne may a-pere;
And by my purs þe same I may seye here.

See also Skelton's, *The Bowge of Courte*, ll. 363-64:

And by his syde his whynarde and his pouche,
The deuyll myghte daunce therin for ony crowche.

This refers, of course, to the cross which formed part of the design stamped on the penny and other coins; the devil would not venture into a purse which contained any of these coins.²

In l. 490, Now-a-days says: "Remembre my brokyn hede in þe worschyppe of þe v. vowellys." This is Dr. Furnivall's reading; Professor Manly's text has "v voli ellys," but he suggests "vij (or xx) devellys"; Dr. Brandl reads "volvellys," and suggests "dewellys"; Mr. Farmer reads "five vowels," and has a note on "volvellys."³ None of these suggestions is satisfactory. In the facsimile of the manuscript the words look most like "v. volvellys,"

¹ J. Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs* (1742), p. 80.

² See also a passage from Massinger's *Bashful Lover*, quoted in Skelton's *Works* (American edition, "British Poets" series), III, 40.

³ J. M. Manly, *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, I, 333; A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas*, p. 57; J. S. Farmer, *Lost Tudor Plays*, pp. 22 and 466.

but might be "v. vowellys" with the *w* carelessly written. However, the expression "worship of the v. vowellys, or volvellys" occurs nowhere else, so far as I can find; and if it did occur it would not fit the context in the play. Mr. Farmer's note on "volvellys" does not help to clear up the obscurity. The "vij (or xx) devellys" are found frequently in mediaeval writings, and could easily be used after the phrase "in the worship of." However, I have not found them in this connection; and, furthermore, that expression would not be particularly suitable for this passage.

A new explanation is suggested here. A "charme to staunch blood," from a manuscript of 1475, ends: "And sey thys charme fyve tymes with fyve pater nosters, in the worschep of the fyve woundys." Another "charme to draw out yren de quarell," from the same manuscript, ends: "And sey thys charme fyve tymes in the worschep of the fyve woundys of Chryst."¹ Now a common mediaeval term for the wounds of Christ was the "five wells."² Hence, by substitution, the "worship of the five wounds" in the charms quoted above would become the "worship of the five wells." I have not found this form of the expression elsewhere, but it is reasonable to suppose that it was used alongside the variant form. The "v. wellys," I think, was the original reading in *Mankind*. The change to "v. vowellys," or "v. volvellys," could easily be the work of a careless scribe. Make the emendation, and we have an expression which exactly fits the context. Now-a-days is talking about the cure of his wound, and he borrows this expression from the charms used at the time in such cures.

In l. 491, Nought refers to the "sytyca in my arme."³ Dr. Brandl's note on "scythica," a herb used for healing wounds, is unnecessary. The modern "sciatica" is evidently the meaning. The objection has been made that the sciatica does not affect the arm; but therein lies the point of the joke. Such a twisting of terms

¹ Both are given in Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, III, 271. For other references to Christ's wounds in charms—but not connected with their "worship"—see *Anglia*, XIX, 80, 81, 85.

² For example, see C. Horstman, *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, II, 440; F. J. Furnivall, *Political, Religious, and Love Poems*, p. 142, ll. 36-37 (revised edition); and two poems by Lydgate, in *Percy Society Publications*, II, 26 and 238.

³ Professor Manly, in his text, rightly assigns this speech to Nought; in the E.E.T.S. text it is a part of Now-a-day's speech.

is entirely in keeping with the character of Nought and of the play as a whole.

In ll. 509-10, Nought, who is ready to go on a thieving expedition with his two companions, says:

Felous, cum forth! & go we hens to-gethyr,
For drede of "in manus tuas," qweke.

The phrase "in manus tuas" occurs twice in the Bible: in Ps. 30:6, "In manus tuas commendo spiritum meum; redemisti me, Domine Deus veritatis"; and in Christ's last words on the cross as recorded in Luke 23:46. The verse from the Psalms formed part of the prayer to be said by the person receiving the sacrament of Extreme Unction.¹ Because of this fact, and also because many condemned prisoners wanted to die with Christ's last words on their lips, the phrase "in manus tuas" was constantly heard at executions, and became a slang term for the execution itself. It is used in this sense in *Mankind*.

While *Mankind* is praying, Tityvillus, intending to divert him from his devotions, whispers (l. 551):

"A schorte preyer thyrllyth hewyn": of þi preyer blyn.

This expression occurs in the poem "The Good Wyfe Wold a Pylgremage," in *Queene Elizabethes Achademy*, etc., ed. F. J. Furnivall (E.E.T.S.), p. 43, ll. 167-68:

A schort prayer wynnythe heyvyn,
the patter noster and an ave.

Cf. also *Piers Plowman*, C, XII, 294 ff.:

And lewede leele laborers . and land-tylynge peuple
Persen with a pater-noster . paradys other heuene,
Passinge purgatorie penaunceles . for here parfit by-leyue;
Breuis oratio penetrat celum.

In the two preceding passages the efficacy of short prayers like the Pater Noster is set forth; but even these are too long for Tityvillus, and he turns the proverb into an argument for inducing *Mankind* to abbreviate the Pater Noster still farther—by desisting from it entirely.²

¹ Myrc, *Instructions for Parish Priests*, p. 54.

² See also "Proverbs of Prophets, Poets, and Saints," in *Minor Poems of the Vernon MS* (E.E.T.S.), II, 552.

In ll. 562-64, Tityvillus says:

yff þe haue ony syluer, in happe, pure brasse,
Take a lytyll powder of Parysch, & cast ouer hys face,
Ande ewyn in þe howll-flyght let hym passe.

This seems to be a reference to a common trick of the alchemists: the turning of copper or brass into a white metal resembling silver, by the use of an arsenic compound, such as orpiment (auripigmentum), trisulphide of arsenic.¹ I have not found the term "powder of Parysch" used elsewhere, but it was probably a popular name for orpiment (cf. our modern Paris green, an arsenic compound, and Paris purple, an arsenious by-product). The alchemical use of the orpiment produced a vile odor. A reading of the passage quoted above, in connection with the preceding lines of the play (ll. 553-61), and a comparison of them with ll. 32-35 of *Colyn Blowbols Testament*² will make the meaning sufficiently clear. The tone of the passage is on the same level with that of several others in the play.

"Howll-flyght" means the dusk of evening, when owls fly.³ In this passage it is used as if it were an alchemical term; if it is, I have not discovered its meaning.

In l. 586, Tityvillus, approaching Mankind, who is asleep, says to the audience: "Qwyst! pesse! þe Deull ys dede! I xall goo ronde in hys ere." The proverb, "Heigh ho, the Devil is dead," is given in Ray's collection,⁴ and it is explained as meaning that a difficulty is almost overcome, a journey almost finished, etc.⁵ The significance of the use of this proverb by Tityvillus is apparent: he has already led Mankind to renounce labor and prayer, the two safeguards which Mercy had recommended against temptation; Mankind's downfall is almost accomplished. Tityvillus now whispers in his ear the suggestion for the dream which completes the task.

In this dream he suggests that Mercy has stolen a horse and a "nete," and that for the crime he now "rydyth ouer þe galous."

¹ E. Von Meyer, *History of Chemistry* (trans. by G. M' Gowan), pp. 37 and 54; and R. Steele, *Mediaeval Lore*, p. 34 (King's Classics).

² W. C. Hazlitt, *Early Popular Poetry of England*, I, 93.

³ See Skelton, "The Douty Duke of Albany," l. 312, in his *Works*, II, 331 (American edition), and "Piers of Fullham," l. 28, in Hazlitt, *Early Popular Poetry*, II, 3.

⁴ J. Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs* (1742), p. 55.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

This figure of *riding* on the gallows as on a horse recalls the fact that the gallows was sometimes popularly known as a horse; as in the Yorkshire riddle quoted by Mr. S. Baring-Gould: "What is the horse that is ridden that never was foaled, and rid with a bridle that never had bit?" The answer is, "The gallows."¹ Mr. Baring-Gould sees in this a reminiscence of "Ogre's horse," the name given to the world-tree on which Odin hanged himself.

New-gyse, who has just escaped hanging because the rope broke, appears on the stage with the "halter" still around his neck. He calls the rope "sent Audrys holy bende," and explains his chafed and swollen neck by saying (ll. 622-23):

I haue a lytyll dyshes, as yt plesse Gode to sende,
With a runnyng rynge-worme.

St. Audry, or Etheldreda, of Ely died of a pestilence, one of the symptoms of which was a great swelling of the neck; cf. New English Dictionary, *s.v.* "Tawdry lace."

In l. 678, Nought excuses his poor handwriting by saying: "I xulde haue don bettur, hade I wyst." "Had I wyst" is a proverbial expression for incompetence and carelessness. Ripley, in his *Compound of Alchymie*, speaking of unlearned and unskilful men who try to be alchemists, and are ragged and lean, says: "And thus for (had I wyst) they suffer losse and wo."² See also Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, Lib. I, l. 1888, and Lib. IV, l. 305; "The Good Wyfe Wold a Pylgremage," l. 120, in *Queene Elizabethes Achademy*, etc., p. 42; "Proverbs of Good Counsel," l. 56, in *ibid.*, p. 69; and a note with a number of references in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, etc., ed. L. Herrig and others, XC, 258-59.

In l. 683, the deposed Edward IV is referred to as "Edwardi nullateni" (not "millateni" as in the E.E.T.S. text)—in mocking allusion to his being no longer king. Cf. Lydgate's *Order of Fools*, where, speaking of various kinds of fools, he says:

N[u]llatensis a-sesythe hath hys bulle
To alle suche, þat neuer of hem shalle the.

¹ S. Baring-Gould, *Strange Survivals*, p. 245.

² E. Ashmole, *Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum* (1652), l. 153.

And later in the same poem there is a reference to "som worthy byshoppe nullatence" who grants the fools a "general pardoun and a patent to be-gyn her dispence."¹

In l. 684, the date of the mock court is given as: "On zestern day, in Feuerere, pe zere passyth fully." I am indebted to Professor Manly for the explanation of the latter part of the date: it means that the year is entirely wanting—the year is unknown.

In l. 743, Mercy uses the expression, "In trust is treason." This is given in Camden's *Remains Concerning Britain* (1870), p. 325, in a list of popular proverbs. See also J. O. Halliwell, *Ludus Coventriae* (Shakespeare Society), p. 241; Hugh Rhode's "Boke of Nurture," in *Early English Meals and Manners*, ed. F. J. Furnivall (E.E.T.S.), p. 91, l. 347; and "The Good Wyfe Wold a Pylgremage," l. 76.

In ll. 746–48, Mercy speaks thus of ingratitude:

As a nobyll versyfyer makyth mencyon in þis verse:
"Lex & natura, Christus et omnia iura
Dampnant in-gratum; lugetur eum fore natum."

Who this "nobyll versyfyer" was, I have not discovered; but Gower places a similar statement at the head of the section on Ingratitude in his *Confessio Amantis* (Lib. V, sec. vii):

Cuncta creatura, deus et qui cuncta creauit,
Dampnant ingrati dicta que facta viri.

This idea he amplifies in the English text, using more of the details found in our play (Lib. V, ll. 4917 ff.):

The bokes spoken of this vice,
And telle how god of his justice,
Be weie of kinde and ek nature
And every liffish creature,
The lawe also, who that it kan,
Thei dampnen an unkinde man.

This passage agrees with the Latin version given in *Mankind* more closely than it does with the one in the *Confessio*. Gower expresses the same idea in the *Mirour de l'Omme*, ll. 6685 ff.

In l. 775, Now-a-days correctly classifies himself when he concludes his speech with the words, "My bolte ys schott," which are

¹ *Queene Elizabethes Achademy*, etc., ed. F. J. Furnivall (E.E.T.S.), p. 83, l. 135; and p. 84, ll. 162–64.

a part of the still familiar proverb, "A fool's bolt is soon shot." This proverb was also current in mediaeval times. It is found in the "Proverbs of Hendyng," l. 85, in K. Bøddeker, *Altenglische Dichtungen des Ms. Harl. 2253*, p. 291; and in "The Good Wyfe Wold a Pylgremage," l. 95.

In ll. 810-11, Mercy exhorts Mankind:

ȝelde me nethyr golde nor tresure, but yowur humbyll obeysyance,
The voluntary subieccyon of yowur hert, & I am content.

The idea in this passage is expressed in a number of places in the Bible, but the phrasing and details are different. These are probably taken from some commentary on Prov. 23:26: "Praebe, fili mi, cor tuum mihi." A passage from the same source is in *Wisdom*, ll. 79-82:

Fili! prebe michi cor tuum!
I aske not ellys of all ȝi substance:
Thy clene hert, ȝi meke obeysance,
yeue me ȝat, & I am contente.

In ll. 850-51, we are told:

Whyll a wond ys fresch, yt ys prowyd curabyll by surgery,
ȝat, yf yt procede ouyrlonge, yt ys cawse of gret grewance.

A similar figure is used in *The Gouvernaunce of Prynces, or Pryvete of Pryveteis*, translated by James Yonge in 1422: "The grete Poet Ouydie Sayth, Pryncipijs obsta, 'Wytstonde the begynnyng,' ffor lyghtyre is a fressh wounde to hele, than a festrid."¹ The latter part of this quotation is probably a popular proverb: it has the form and typical subject-matter of one.

One of the principal features of *Mankind* is the satire on contemporary manners and customs. New-gyse, Now-a-days, and Nought, as their names indicate, represent the young dandies of the time who pride themselves on being up to date. The words "new gyse" and "nowadays" were commonly used by writers in commenting on the new styles and manners. Thus in *Nature*,² Pride, speaking of Man's clothes, says:

But in fayth I lyke not your aray
It ys not the fassyon that goth now a day
For now there ys a new guyse.

¹ *Secreta Secretorum*, ed. R. Steele (E.E.T.S.), p. 161.

² Brandl, *Quellen*, p. 105, ll. 1024 ff.

See also Skelton's *Garlande of Laurell*:

For the gyse now adays
Of sum iangelyng iays
Is to discommende
That they can not amende.¹

Nought is a fit companion for New-gyse and Now-a-days: he is chronically without money, and he loves to make merry and to play the fool with the common tapster of Bury (ll. 265-69). Here, in epitome, is the life of our three characters and of the young dandies of the time whom they represent.

New-gyse, Now-a-days, and Nought are, of course, dressed in the extreme of fashion, probably even to the point of caricature, and in this way furnish part of the satire on dress in the play; but the satire is more marked in their manner of fitting out Mankind with a new jacket (ll. 664 ff.), which the fashion of the day dictated should be very short. New-gyse objects to Mankind's broad gown, and suggests that it could be sold for enough to provide him with many jackets. Mankind consents to exchange the gown for a jacket, provided the latter affords him covering enough to keep out the cold. New-gyse accordingly goes out to make the exchange. He is gone for so long a time that Now-a-days calls for him, remarking that the jacket will not be worth a farthing (ll. 687-88)—he must be trying to get one with only a farthing's worth of cloth in it. New-gyse re-enters with a jacket which he declares is scanty enough to allow Mankind to leap lightly about without encumbrance from it. Nought, however, objects to the cut—"yt ys not schapyn worth a morsell of brede"; and especially to the size—"ther ys to moche cloth, yt weys as ony lede." Accordingly, he takes it and abbreviates it still more—till it is only a suggestion of a jacket we may believe, for New-gyse exclaims with delight when it is returned: "Hay, doog! hay, whoppe! whoo! go yowur wey lyghtly! ȝe are well made for to ren" (ll. 713-14).

Short jackets were the style in the fifteenth century, as is proved by the statutes which were made from time to time to regulate the length of this garment. Thus in 1463 it was ordered "that no knight, under the estate of a lord, esquire, gentleman, nor none other person,

¹ *The Poetical Works of John Skelton*, Vol. II, p. 226, ll. 1261-64 (American edition).

shall use or wear from the feast of All Saints, which shall be in the year of our Lord M. cccc. lxx., any gown, jacket, or coat, unless it be of such length that the same may cover his privy members and buttocks."¹ This statute was not enforced, however, and another, phrased in practically the same words, was adopted in 1482.² At the time of our play, then, the fashion was still in vogue.

New-gyse, Now-a-days, and Nought also defend the contemporary fashion of prolix speaking and writing. In l. 102, Mercy, whose theory is better than his practice, advises them to use "few wordis; few & well sett." Thomas Betson, in his *Ryght Profytable Treatyse*, f. b vi,³ gives the same advice: "Beware of hyghe speche & clamorous/and see that thy wordes be fewe well sette & resonable." See also the poem on "The Siege of Rouen," in *Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. Gairdner (Camden Society, 1876), p. 27: "Speke wordys but lytyle and welle hym set." But New-gyse declares:

Ser, yt ys þe new gyse & þe new jett:
Many wordis, & schortely sett:
Thys ys þe new gyse, euery dele.

Anyone who is acquainted with the literature of the fifteenth century will readily agree with New-gyse that this is the fashion of the age.

These three characters also join Mischief and Tytyvillus in ridiculing the use of Latin quotations and pompous, Latinized diction by Mercy and Mankind. The latter, in this respect, were following the fashion of the writers of the age; but it was a clerical fashion, not one that was affected by the class represented by New-gyse and his fellows. The ridicule sometimes takes the form of "dog-Latin," as in ll. 56 ff., 391 ff., 673 ff., and 768. Sometimes they use quotations from the Bible or church services, to which they give a perverted meaning to suit their purpose; thus, ll. 317-19, from Pss. 17:26-27-132:1; l. 468, from Rev. 17:14; l. 480, a part of Ps. 113:1 (second set of verses); and l. 433, a part of a common liturgical formula.

¹ *Statutes at Large*, III, 362.

² *Ibid.*, p. 455.

³ Facsimile reprint, Cambridge University Press, 1905.

PLACE

Mr. Pollard's conclusions concerning the place of performance for *Mankind* are, briefly stated, as follows: It was produced by a strolling company of players, acting probably in the courtyards of inns, in the country districts centering around the towns of Cambridge and King's Lynn, respectively. My conclusions agree essentially with his, but I have found some new details that may be of interest.

Hitherto, the identification of the towns named in ll. 498-508 has been a matter of conjecture, and, in some cases, of doubt. All the editors have agreed as to Trumpington, Waltom, Gayton, Fullburn, Massyngham, and Botysam. Their identity has been proved in the case of all these towns except Gayton and Massyngham by the investigations given earlier in this article. I have found no references to the Patrykes of Massyngham and the Bollmans of Gayton; but there can be little doubt that these places have been correctly identified.

Dr. Furnivall thinks that the Soffeham of l. 508 is Swaffham, in Norfolk. This is not certain, however, for, as Dr. Brandl points out, there was also a Swaffham in Cambridgeshire, and I have found Hammonds in both the Norfolk and the Cambridgeshire towns at about the time of our play (see above, under "Hamonde of Soffeham"). Swaffham Bulbeck is about 7 miles northeast by east from Cambridge, and only a few miles from Bottisham. It would, therefore, fit the conditions of the play as well as the Norfolk town does. However, as the writer seems to be making "a deliberate attempt to keep up interest in two different districts by local allusions very equitably distributed,"¹ and as the substitution of the Cambridgeshire town would destroy the balance between the Cambridgeshire and Norfolk places, making the proportion 6 to 3, instead of 5 to 4, it is perhaps better to retain the Norfolk Swaffham. The choice of either town does not materially change the results.

Sanston and Hanston (ll. 498-99) have puzzled the editors. Dr. Furnivall, reading the names as just given, suggests Santon, Norfolk,

¹ *Macro Plays*, p. xii. The attempt to keep the references to the two districts balanced becomes even more apparent when we notice that three men in Cambridgeshire and three in Norfolk are to be visited; the other men named are to be "spared."

and Ampton, Suffolk, or Hunston, Norfolk. Dr. Brandl, at the suggestion of Dr. Stevenson, reads Sauston and Hauston, and identifies them with Sawston and Hauxton, both near Cambridge.¹ Mr. Pollard adopts the latter readings. That Sawston is correct is proved by the presence of the family of Huntingdons in that place at the time of the play (see above, under "Huntyngton"). Hence Hauston is probably the correct reading for the other name, for it makes a better rhyme with Sauston than Hanston would, and there were Thyrlowes in Hauxton near the time of the play (cf. Wylliam Thurlay, in l. 499; and see above, under "Thurlay"). Moreover, the three towns, Sawston, Hauxton, and Trumpington, named in three successive lines of the play, form a group, all within a few miles of each other, just south of Cambridge. Mr. Pollard adopted the readings Sauston and Hauston; hence this investigation does not alter his conclusions, but merely confirms the data with which he worked.

Why were these two districts, one centering about Cambridge, the other about King's Lynn, chosen as the field of operations by the strolling players? The two places were nearly forty miles apart—no mean distance for a company which Mr. Pollard pictures as "trudging through mire and snow" as they went from one place of performance to another. A glance at the map will answer this question. The two towns are connected by the rivers Cam and Ouse, which in the fifteenth century formed an excellent waterway, and which therefore furnished the players a convenient method of travel.² Hence the company probably covered the longer stages of their journey by boat. It is not likely, however, that they made the entire forty-mile trip in one stage. The local allusions show that the play was intended primarily for performance in the rural districts surrounding the two towns; but it does not follow that they confined their operations to these localities. There is no reason to suppose that they would travel the forty miles intervening without trying to pick up some money on the way. So to Mr. Pollard's picture of the players trudging through the mire we may add the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. xi.

² For the importance of this waterway to the Sturbridge Fair at Cambridge, see J. T. Rogers, *History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, I, 142.

picture of them floating down the river and stopping, as opportunity offered, to give their performance throughout the sections bordering the streams.

AUTHOR

There is some evidence in ll. 498-500 that the author was a Cambridgeshire man who was especially familiar with the neighborhood around the town of Cambridge. The three towns Sawston, Hauxton, and Trumpington are named first. These towns lie near Cambridge—the first, about 5 miles south by east; the second, $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles south by west; the third, 2 miles south—and thus form a compact group. It will be noticed, also, that these three are assigned in a group to New-gyse. The places named later are more scattered, and are not assigned in distinct groups: two Norfolk towns and one Cambridgeshire town—about forty miles apart—are given to Now-a-days; and the same number with the same arrangement, to Nought. This assigning of a compact group to one man, and naming it first in the list; then the shifting of later assignments from one county to the other is what one would naturally expect of a writer who was familiar with the first group, but who was not so well acquainted with the other towns and thought of them merely as places lying in the territory that was to be covered by the company on its tour. This theory is also supported by the phraseology in ll. 498-500. New-gyse's words, "fyrst I xall be-gyn" at Sawston, "fro thens I xall go" to Hauxton, "ande so forth" to Trumpington, suggest the work of a man who knew that short three or four mile walk from Sawston to Trumpington, through Hauxton.

For trying to determine the position held by this man, and his affiliations with contemporary classes of society, we have the following data: his acquaintance with the life and tastes of the country people; his knowledge of Latin, as shown by his coining of Latinized words and his frequent use of Latin phrases; his satire against the church; his predilection for coarse humor; his indifference to the theological system of the church (see p. 119); and his knowledge of legal terms and methods of court procedure. What shall we conclude from this data? We may take for granted his Latin education; and we may assume that he was in close touch with rural life. Just what his position was, is not certain. He may have been a man in

holy orders; certainly, as Dr. Brandl points out,¹ with the example of Skelton in mind, we find nothing in the data to contradict this theory. The satire does not prove him a Lollard or an enemy of the church, for satire on ecclesiastical abuses was written by devout and orthodox men. The writer's indifference to the theological system of the church may be due to the fact that this is only a sham morality (see p. 120), written with a very secondary interest in the lesson to be taught. One theory, then, is that the writer was a man in orders; if such was the case, our most natural assumption is that he held a rural living near Cambridge.

Another possible conclusion is that the author was a man trained for the law; this is suggested by his familiarity with legal terms and the method of conducting court. Cf. "cepe coppus" and "non est inventus" (ll. 773-74) and the mock court scene (ll. 657 ff.). In this case we may suppose him to have been a lawyer, perhaps keeping an office in the town of Cambridge, and having clients among the neighboring country people. However, the legal knowledge shown in the play is not so extensive that the latter might not have been written by a layman. Either of these suggestions is possible and plausible; neither is certain. But to whatever class we assign the author, he was the first writer of extant moralities to make a very definite step toward the secularization of the morality type of play. He was one of the earliest of English "dramatists" who wrote primarily for the sake of the play, and only incidentally for the sake of the moral or religious lesson.

THE MORALITY STRUCTURE OF THE PLAY

The serious part of the plot of *Mankind* is of the usual morality type—the conflict of the forces of good and evil for the soul of Mankind. The following analysis brings out an interpretation of the temptation scene which, I believe, has not been given before. In the analysis I have adopted Mr. Ramsay's division of the play into four stages, with a change of the point of division between the last two.²

1. Innocence (1-315): Mankind does not appear until l. 181. The preceding part of the play is taken up mainly with a preliminary

¹ A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas*, p. xxxi.

² R. L. Ramsay, *Magnificence* (E.E.T.S.), p. clx.

skirmish between Mercy and Myscheff, the latter aided by the three Vices. Mankind then enters, complaining of the constant fight between his soul and his body. Mercy gives him instruction, interrupted by considerable horseplay by the Vices, as to how he may keep his body in subjection; and leaves after injunctions to beware of Tityvillus and his fellows, to "do truly yowur labure, & kepe yowur haly day" (l. 293), and to "do truly yowur labure, & be neuer ydyll" (l. 301). Labor and the observance of his religious duties are to be Mankind's safeguards. The latter declares that the "rebellyn of my flesch" is now overcome; and hangs a charm—a verse of Scripture—about his neck to protect him from the forces of evil.

2. Temptation (316-599): Mankind proceeds at once to carry out Mercy's instruction about labor, by setting to work digging with his spade "to eschew ydullness" (l. 322) and also presumably to prepare the ground for planting. Immediately New-gyse, Now-a-days, and Nought begin their temptation by ridiculing his work, and thus trying to make him give it up. They fail, however, and are beaten by Mankind with his spade, the symbol of labor. By labor he has overcome his enemies. Thereupon he triumphantly departs with his spade, to "lyue euer with labure, to corecte my insolence" (l. 403). Myscheff enters, and sympathizes with his fellows; then they call in Tityvillus to help. Tityvillus is wilier than the others; and instead of ridiculing Mankind's work he proceeds to make the labor difficult and unprofitable by putting a board in the ground where Mankind is digging, and by stealing his seed. Mankind quits work in disgust: "here I gyf wppe my spade, for now & for euer"; he refuses to work any longer to keep his body occupied and thus out of mischief: "to occupye my body, I wyll not put me in deuer" (ll. 542-43). He has now disobeyed the first part of Mercy's injunction. He has not, however, given up the second part; and he kneels to say his Pater Noster. Tityvillus whispers in his ear that a short prayer is better than a long one, and stops even the short Pater Noster by a suggestion not more delicate than many others in the play. Acting upon the suggestion, Mankind leaves the stage; when he returns, he announces that he is tired of both labor and prayer and will have no more to do with them though

Mercy be angry (l. 579). He goes to sleep, and Tityvillus completes his estrangement from Mercy by making him dream that Mercy has been hanged for stealing. Mankind has forsworn both labor and prayer, and falls at once into evil ways.

3. Life-in-Sin (600-803): Mankind hastens to join New-gyse, Now-a-days, and Nought in their manner of living. As there is little of the morality element in this section, the analysis of it is omitted.

4. Repentance (804-907): Mercy exhorts Mankind to repent; the latter says that he has sinned beyond hope of redemption. Mercy declares that it is never too late to repent, and that he is ever ready to help those who seek him. Mankind finally submits, and returns to a life of righteousness.

Thus Mankind falls into sin through neglecting labor and his religious duties. He is redeemed merely by asking and receiving Mercy, without the help of the sacrament of penance. It is noteworthy that there is very little mention in the play of the theological teachings of the church. The most important references are Mercy's injunction to keep the holy days (l. 293), and the incidental references to the mass (l. 291) and to "masse & matens, owres & prime" (l. 705). Compare this with the well-worked-out theological scheme for man's fall and redemption as given in *Wisdom*, written only ten years earlier. There man falls by the three successive steps—suggestion, delectation, and consent—into the three chief sins—pride, covetousness, and lechery. He is redeemed by undergoing the three steps in the sacrament of penance—contrition, confession, and satisfaction—and is reformed in the trinity of the virtues—faith, hope, and charity.¹ In *Mankind*, it is apparent that we are dealing with a type of morality play very different from *Wisdom*. A very simple framework has taken the place of the elaborate theological scheme.

Note also ll. 878-81, in which the writer tries to identify the forces of evil—Tityvillus and his companions—with the three traditional enemies of mankind—the World, the Flesh, and the Devil:

New-gyse, Now-a-dayis, Nowgth, þe 'world' we may hem call;
 & propyrly Titiuilly syngnyfyes the fend of helle;
 the flesch,—þat ys, þe unclene concupiscens of þour body
 these be your iij gostly enemyis.

¹W. K. Smart, *Some English and Latin Sources for the Morality of Wisdom*, p. 45.

The comparison, it will be seen, breaks down, for Flesh is not represented on the stage by any of Tityvillus' crew, and Myscheff, one of the chief forces of evil, is not included in the three enemies—indeed, there is no place for him. This looks as if the author brought in whatever comic characters he needed, without thinking of how they would fit into the traditional morality-play trinity, and only as an afterthought decided to identify them as well as he could with that trinity.

Again, in the entire play Tityvillus and his companions are absent from the stage during only 333 lines; one or more of them are present during 574 lines—about two-thirds of the play—and whenever they are on the stage they dominate the scene with their rough humor.

From these facts we conclude that this is only a sham morality—with a slight morality framework that offers an excuse for the production of the play, whose chief business is to entertain the country audiences with its coarse humor, and bring their "reyallys" and groats into the company's treasury.

SOURCE

I have found no direct source for any passage in *Mankind*; in fact, most of the passages have specific references to characters and situations in the play which show that they were written for the occasion, and not borrowed almost verbatim, as were large parts of *Wisdom*, for instance. Two sources have been suggested: one—the "half-acre" episode in *Piers Plowman*—by Miss Mabel M. Keiller;¹ the other—the poem "Merci Passith Riȝtwisnes"—by W. R. Mackenzie.² Lack of space forbids a detailed analysis of these so-called "sources." At the most, however, they can have furnished only slight suggestions for *Mankind*, and it is very doubtful if they did that much. Certainly there is no significant parallelism between the field episode in *Piers Plowman* and the digging scene in *Mankind*. Likewise, the poem "Merci Passith Riȝtwisnes" has no significant points in common with *Mankind*. The fact that Mercy and a sinner appear in a poem and a play, and use the same *general* arguments in both, does not show that one borrowed from the other. The association between Mercy and a sinner is obvious enough; bring

¹ *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, June, 1911.

² *Ibid.*, March, 1912.

the two together and the nature of their dialogue is determined by the nature of the characters and the situation. In the absence of parallelism in phrasing and details of situation, then, there is no reason for supposing that the writer of *Mankind* knew this poem.

Of course the author used much conventional material, as the parallels already cited show, but he reshaped it to fit his play. A number of the ideas in the serious parts are from the Bible; and it may not be out of place to indicate these: l. 43, "The corn xall be sauysde, pe chaffe xall be brente," from Matt. 3:12, or Luke 3:17; l. 175, "But such as pei haue sowyn, such xall pei repe," from Gal. 6:7; ll. 216-17, "ze [Mercy] be approxymatt to Gode, and nere of hys consell; He hat instytut you a-boue all hys werkis," perhaps a free rendering of Ps. 130:7, "For with the Lord there is mercy," and of Ps. 145:9, "And his tender mercies are over all his works"; l. 221, "Vita hominis est milicia super terram," from Job 7:1 (not in the English version); l. 357, "Why stonde ye ydyll?" perhaps from Matt. 20:6, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" ll. 399-400, "I do yt not a-lone: With pe helpe of pe grace of Gode, I resyst my fon," perhaps adapted from I Cor. 15:10, "But I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me"; l. 760, "Vanitas vanitatum, all ys but a vanyte," from Eccles. 1:2; l. 839, "To truste ouermoche In a prince, yt ys not expedient," from Ps. 146:3, "Put not your trust in princes"; l. 855 (referring to the punishment for sins after death), "But, whan ze be go, vsque ad minimum quadrantem ze schall rekyn pis ryght," perhaps suggested by Matt. 5:26, where Christ, speaking of a man committed to prison, says, "Amen dico tibi, non exies inde, donec reddas novissimum quadrantem."

This list does not include the passages which have been previously discussed in this article, or those whose biblical sources have been pointed out by the editors of the play.

W. K. SMART

ARMOUR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *PIERS THE PLOWMAN*

That I was not the first student of *Piers the Plowman* to entertain the idea that the workmanship indicated more than one author is shown not only by the passages from Thomas Wright quoted by Samuel Moore in his discussion of the *Piers the Plowman* tradition but also by some passages in the writings of that pioneer American scholar George P. Marsh.

To the first of these passages my attention was recently directed by Mr. Thomas A. Knott. It reads as follows:

The manuscripts of *Piers Ploughman* vary so widely that Whitaker could explain the discrepancies only by the supposition of a *rifaccimento* by the author himself, at a considerably later period, when his opinions had undergone important changes; but a comparison of Whitaker's and Wright's texts reveals so wide differences in grammar, vocabulary, and orthography that it is quite unreasonable to refer the two recensions to one writer, and it is by no means improbable that both are very unlike the author's original.¹

This naturally suggested the examination of Marsh's other volume on the English language. Lecture VII, on "The Author of *Piers Ploughman* and His Imitators," contains many sane and illuminating remarks on the poems, the most significant of which, for our present topic, is this:

The number of early manuscripts of this work which still survive proves its general diffusion; and the wide variations which exist between the copies show that they had excited interest enough to be thought worthy of careful revision by the original author, or, as is more probable, of important modification by the numerous editors and transcribers under whose recension they subsequently passed. This, indeed, was the custom of the time; but in most cases, copyists only accommodated the dialect of the author to that of their own age or district, or, at most, added here and there an explanatory gloss, whereas in some of the later manuscripts of *Piers Ploughman*, a very different tone of sentiment prevails from that which marks what is believed to be the original text of the work. It had become eminently a popular possession, a didactic catechism. This fact and its anonymous character would be thought to justify licenses in copyists, whereas the works of Gower and Chaucer came in a purely literary form, and with an authority derived

¹ George P. Marsh, *Lectures on the English Language*, first series, revised and enlarged ed. (New York: Scribner, 1887, p. 364, note). This volume was first published in 1859.

from the social position of the writers, which secured them from being so freely tampered with by later editors; and consequently the differences between different manuscripts of those authors are generally grammatical or orthographical merely.¹

That I was ignorant of these passages when I formulated my own views can be attributed only to failure of memory; for I not only ought to have seen them but actually did see them in 1885, when I made what I supposed to be a thorough and profitable study of Marsh's books.

It will be noted that Marsh's views are much more precise and definite than those of Thomas Wright, and contain in effect, though not in detail, the conclusions for which I have contended. I am glad to have the support of an independent utterance from a scholar so distinguished for soundness of taste and sanity of judgment as was Mr. Marsh.

JOHN M. MANLY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ G. P. Marsh, *Origin and History of the English Language*, 3d ed. (New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co., 1872, p. 297). The preface of the first edition is repeated in the third. It dates the contents of the lectures back to 1860-61, when they were delivered at the Lowell Institute, in Boston. This passage occurs in the same form in the editions of 1885 and 1892. The 1892 edition changes the *they's* of lines 3 and 6 to *it*.

CHAUCERIANA

THE CANTERBURY TALES

A 82, *I gesse*. Examples of this "Yankeeism" in British poetry are:
Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, 1539-40:

And to our wish I see one hither speeding,
An Ebrew, as *I guess*, and of our tribe.

Tennyson, *Maud*, Part II, 5, 3:

And another, a lord of all things, praying
To his own great self, as *I guess*.

In my *Notes on Chaucer* I have called attention to Shelley, *Adonais*, 31.
A 110, *woodcraft*. Is a knowledge of "woodcraft" ascribed to Paris, the brother of Hector, in *Roman de Troie*, 5455-56?

Traire saveit merveilles bien,
Mais sot de bois sor tote rien.

A 200, *in good poynt*. Cf. *Sir Ferumbras*, 515:

it wil don him be hol and sounde: & maky him in god poynt.

A 258, *love-dayes*. These were frequently used for fraudulent purposes;
cf. *Piers Plowman* C text, Passus XII, vss. 16 ff.

A 264. In *Roman de Troie*, vs. 5330 it is recorded that Hector stammered:

Mais un sol petit baubeiol.

A 637-38,

And whan that he wel dronken hadde the wyn,
Than wolde he speke no word but Latyn.

In the *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon* of K. F. T. Wander I find the following under "Latein" (Vol. V):

Post sumptum vinum loquitur mea lingua Latinum,
Et bibo cum bis ter, sum qualibet arte magister.

also (Vol. II):

Ille bibat vinum qui scit dictare Latinum.

In the *Life of Saint Meriasek*, a Cornish miracle play written at the beginning of the sixteenth century, edited by Whitley Stokes, occurs the following (vss. 80-81):

pan ve luen ov zos a wyn
ny gara covs mes laten,

which is translated by Mr. Stokes: "When my tot may be full of wine I love not to speak (aught) save Latin."

A distinguished philologist has informed me that the proverb was common in the University of Strassburg when he was a student there. Another scholar relates an anecdote of an inebriated student, somewhere in Germany, who said, in my informant's presence: "Wenn ich besoffen bin so sprech' ich nur Französisch."

A 1422, Chaucer probably had in mind the biblical phrase (Josh. 9:21, 23):

"hewers of wood and drawers of water."

A 1660, for the exaggeration, cf. *Roman de Troie*, 24372-73:

Jusqu' as ventres sont li destrier
En sanc vermeil.

A 1697, *Under the sonne*, defined by Mather as "to the eastward under a low-lying sun." I have observed only one other instance of this use of the phrase, and that is in the Flemish *Reinaert de Vos*, 759-60:

Hi sach, sunt onder die sonne,
Lamfroit come geronnen.

"He saw sidelong, under the sun, Lamfroit come running."

A 1910, Coral, as a building material, occurs in *Sir Ferumbras* 1324-27:

þe walles of þe chambre were: araid for þe nones,
y-maked of ful riche gere: of coral and riche stones,
þe wyndowes wern y-mad of iaspre: & of oþre stones fyne,
ypoudred wip perree of polastre: þe leues [= folding-doors] were massalyne
[? = brass].

In *Roman de Troie* 14631 ff. there is an elaborate description of a chamber of alabaster, the translucency of which material was observed by the author.

A 2160, *cloothe of Tars*. I cannot, on any evidence accessible to me, agree with the New English Dictionary in identifying this word *Tars* with the mythical *Tarsia* or *Tharsia* in the confines of China. To cite Mandeville as an authority, as that dictionary does, is a good deal like appealing to Baron Munchausen. The name really comes from *Tarsus*, as is nowhere better shown than by the title of the romance of *The Kyng of Tars and the Soudon of Damas*. But mediaeval ideas about the place were hazy, as is shown by Boccaccio's coupling *Tarso* with *Sidon*, and calling *Sidon*, *Parthian* (*Teseide*, 8, stanzas 35 and 40). He seems to have regarded *Tars* as another name for *Tyre*, and to have thought that both *Tyre* and *Sidon* were in the Far East. "Cloth of Tars" is, according to all accessible evidence, "cloth of Tarsus," just as "damask" is "cloth of Damascus." The following examples of the phrase "cloth of Tars" do not solve the problem, but, in the dearth of evidence, are worth noting:

Sir Ferumbras, 4463-64: And we hau her scarletes & grene, & cloþes of tarse,
and of sulk ful schene, & cloþes eke of golde.

Sir Ferumbras, 5077: On a cloþ of tarse, ryche & fyn.

2698, *in memorie*. "Conscious," "in his senses." For memory = "mind," cf. *Comus*, 205-6:

a thousand fantasies

Begin to throng into my memory.

Webster, *Duchess of Malfi*, I, 1:

I am making my will (as 'tis fit princes should
In perfect memory), and, I pray, sir, tell me,
Were not one better make it smiling, thus,
Than in deep groans and terrible ghastly looks, etc.

Webster, *The Devil's Law*, Case 2, 1:

He died in perfect memory, I hope, and made me his heir.

2803-5: In my *Notes on Chaucer* I have hunted a false trail in seeking to find the source of the idea that the heart is the seat of the intellect in Aristotle. Chaucer and Boccaccio both derived the idea from the Bible. Cf. I Kings 3:9. The Jews seem to have derived this conception from Egypt; see J. H. Breasted, *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, *passim*.

HENRY BARRETT HINCKLEY

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Shakespeare's Theater. By ASHLEY H. THORNDIKE. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

This is a worth-while book, careful in method, admirable in tone, positive, unusually clear, and in many respects unexpectedly comprehensive. Besides the chapters naturally to be looked for upon the theaters, there are others dealing with Shakespeare's London, the court drama, government regulation, the dramatic companies, the authors, actors and acting, and, perhaps freshest and most illuminating of all, the Elizabethan audience. The book is also well illustrated and provided with good bibliographies which include most recent publications, though in those on the stage no reference is made either to Miss Charlotte Porter's extended discussions in the *First Folio* Shakespeare nor to the several recent papers by Professor T. S. Graves. Space is lacking for any further notice of these subjects, and for anything but the most superficial discussion of the more important matters concerning the theaters and the methods of stage presentation.

The most striking characteristic of the book is Professor Thorndike's obvious desire to take all possible influences into account, and his method of explaining Elizabethan practice by reference both to its antecedents in the mediaeval period and its developments during the Restoration. His treatment of the theater offers little that is new. Admitting the probability of variation and of change, he tries to construct a typical theater rather than to arrive at a precise knowledge of any one. His plan of the Fortune (p. 75) is surely wrong in one particular: no practical stage manager would ever build a theater in which there was no easy means of passage, concealed from the audience, from one side of the stage to the other. Such a passage must have existed, diminishing the depth of the rear stage or enforcing a slight projection such as is illustrated in the Messalina picture. On the existence of this passage also depend the central doors from the rear stage, made so much of by some students. Concerning the balcony, the hut, the tiring-room, etc., very little is said, and many other subjects of interest—those discussed for example by Professor Graves and Mr. W. J. Lawrence—are rather strangely neglected.

On stage presentation Professor Thorndike shows significant advances. No longer do we find attempts to impose modern ideas of propriety and realism upon even the Scripture cycles, nor the Elizabethan stage represented as an unsatisfactory approximation to that of modern melodrama. Professor Thorndike represents it rather as a transition stage, half mediaeval, half modern, or indeed as more than half mediaeval, since he agrees that the

front stage was much more important than the rear, at least through Shakespeare's period. It is exactly this view which, despite the overwhelming evidence in its favor, has caused so much difference of opinion.

Concerning one important point I must comment a little more in detail. Professor Thorndike says that for the use on the front stage of simultaneous, and therefore to us incongruous, properties there is insufficient evidence. He offers no evidence against it, however, nor does he show that he has considered the evidence for it. So far to be sure only a little of this evidence has been presented, and here there is space only to hint at it. I cannot believe that he has sufficiently considered the practical difficulties of placing in the cramped quarters of the rear stage some of the settings which we know existed, nor the several contemporary allusions which at least hint at their position on the front stage. More than that, there are many plays which, if they used settings at all—and it would be absurd to imagine they did not—violate the principle of the continuous act repeatedly. Moreover, granted that the front stage was mediaeval in principle, why suppose simultaneous properties would have seemed out of place upon it? Professor Thorndike himself truly says that any feeling of incongruity from imaginary shifting of place depends largely on the assumption that the main stage is some particular spot. Precisely the same thing is true of simultaneous properties. Finally there is the principle of recurring settings, briefly suggested by me in *Modern Philology*, XII, 253. It is the only explanation yet suggested for an apparent and curious inconsistency in the use of the rear stage and the bringing out of properties on the front stage, which admits of any sort of proof. That the plays do so extraordinarily conform to it, provided the "trees" and the "throne" are allowed upon the front stage, is surely a matter not to be disregarded. No doubt the tendency was against the admission of large properties to the front stage, but the evidence seems to me at least to show that they were often present there through the life of Shakespeare. Professor Thorndike's view is attractive in its simplicity and moderation and will especially appeal to those who believe that in any disputed matter there is much to be said on both sides. In a question of fact, however, the ultimate opinion must rest upon the existing evidence.

Professor Thorndike says little concerning the technic of Shakespeare's plays as influenced by the conditions in which he worked, and fails to notice some important difficulties, I think, of Elizabethan stagecraft, but to balance this lack there is the positive merit of abstaining from theories for which the only basis is the imagination of the writer. The book is certainly the best presentation of the field as a whole which has yet appeared in any language, and it provides a valuable starting point for future work. Thus it is an admirable publication for this anniversary year, and Professor Thorndike is to be congratulated upon it.

GEORGE FULLMER REYNOLDS

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

